4.

A DISCOURSE OF Monſr. VIGIER TO The Lord Abbot Goddon, Great Dean of the Cathedral Church of TOUL in Lorrain.

Concerning the Book of

Monſr. ARNAUD, Doctor of the Sorbon;

ENTITULED,

The Perpetuity of the Faith of the Catholick Church, touching the EUCHARIST, Maintained againſt the Book of Monſieur CLAUDE.

Engliſhed out of French.

In which *Diſcourſe* is very briefly diſcovered the *Vanity* and *Ineffectualneſs* of that Pompous Volume of the *SORBONIST.*

In the SAVOY:
For *Job. Martin* Printer to the *Royal Society*, at the Sign of the Bell in S. *Pauls* Church-yard, and a little without *Temple-Bar*. 1670.

4

C
T
I.
II.
III
IV

THE CONTENTS OF THIS DICOURSE.

THe occasion and design of it.

I. *Reflexion, where it is shewed by the acknowledgment of Monsieur* Arnaud *himself, that he might have cut off three Fourths of his Book, without taking away any thing Essential.*

II. *Reflexion, which sheweth, that people have not been forward to have this Book of Monsieur* Arnaud, *because there is expected a Volume of his, of more importance.*

III. *Reflexion, wherein is noted, That the fierce and insulting Spirit, wherewith Monsieur* Arnaud *treateth Monsieur* Claude, *hath made us averse from the reading of it.*

IV. *Reflexion, wherein the Author answers to three Crimes, wherewith Monsieur* Arnaud *unduly chargeth those of the Protestant Communion. The first is, that it is possible, the*

Church should subsist no more. The second that they have introduced detestable Morals. The third, that they favor and support by their Principles the Errors of the Socinians.

V. *Reflexion, where the Author examineth the proofs of Monsieur* Arnaud, *for the* first *Supposition of the Book of the* Perpetuity, *which consists in the Union of all the Oriental Churches with the* Roman, *about the matter of the Eucharist in the time of* Paschasius.

VI. *Reflexion, in which the Author evinceth that Monsieur* Arnaud *hath no way proved the* second *Supposition of the Book of the* Perpetuity, *which consists in the Adoration of the Body of* Jesus Christ *present upon the Altars, in the time of the same* Paschasius.

SIR,

SIR,

YOu have demanded my thoughts, concerning the ſucceſs, which Monſieur Arnaud's *laſt Book againſt M.* Claude *hath met with amongſt Us, in ſo preſſing and civil a way, that I could not defend my ſelf againſt it. I pretend not to penetrate into your heart, nor to divine a thing which you have concealed from me; poſſibly I ſhould not miſs the mark, nor be much wide from your thoughts, if I ſhould believe, that the opinion you have had of my ſincerity, in ſpeaking of things without prejudice, and the* Idea *you have formed of the Triumphs of M.* Arnaud's *Book, have induced you to deſire this of me, thinking it to be an infallible means to make me acknowledge*

the Injustice of our Cause touching t
important subject, and even to make
forsake my party: But, I shall conte
my self to give you satisfaction wi
out entring into this examen; a
what-ever it be, I shall only tell you
this to point, that neither my sinceri
nor Monsieur Arnaud's *Book have giv*
me the least disposition to answer
thing in favour of this motive, if i
that which hath set you on work.

And indeed, Sir, I *shall tell you fr*
ly, that this Work of M. Arnaud *h*
not found that success, which his frie
expected from it, nor obtain'd that
influence, which some of our profes
might apprehend fram the same.
was expected with impatience on b
sides: On the one, *he was look'd u*
as a Victorious General, carrying terr
with him every where; and, one
should discomfit his Enemies at the
encounter; who should make as m
Conquests as he had Readers; who sho
dissipate at his first setting out the

lus

sions and enchantments which the Rhetorick of M. Claude *was bold to carry even into the Cabinet of the greatest persons amongst them: On the* other, *he was considered as a formidable enemy, that was able at least, by the strength of his Eloquence and Wit to disturb the Joy they possess'd, to cast things back again into the hazard of a new Combat, and to make a victory doubtful, which seem'd could not be disputed with them in reason, after that the most Learned and the most Ambitious of all Societies had found to their great regret, that they had not been able to succeed in it.*

Neither of the two parties were much in the wrong: For, what, I pray, was not to be expected from so learn'd and polite a Pen as that of M. Arnaud, *and of his Friends the Gentlemen of the* Port-Royal? *What was not to be believ'd of those worthy Defendants of the sentiments of Great St.* Augustin, *touching the Efficacy of Divine Grace? What*

was not the Book of M. Claude, *whose cause and profession are none of the most favour d, to fear of the Eloquence, Power, Dexterity, Credit, and good Fortune of those Gentlemen, who so frequently have beaten the innumerable troups of the* Molinists, *who have divided your Schooles and your Churches, between* Victorious *and* Sufficient *Grace; who have been capable to perswade men, that the Council of* Trent *was not against them; who at a time, when their vertue was seen to succumb to the number of their Persecutors, have found in the Wisdom of our Incomparable Monarch, and in the extraordinary Prudence of the Pope, a return which was beyond their hopes, and which hath been the most splendid and the most glorious, that ever was seen in a like conjuncture.*

In the mean time, the Book of M. Arnaud *hath made much less noise, since it hath appear d, than it did before it came abroad; His triumphs are only in the*

he magnificent Attestations of his Approbators, and M. Claude *hath not received the least wound from it.*

Whence, I pray, Sir, comes this notable difference? Is it, that Monsieur Arnaud, *tired by his first combats, hath not had the same vigour against this last Adversary? Is it, that being employ'd in things more essential to him, he hath not used all the attention which was requisite for this famous Answer? Is it, that he hath neglected himself from the consideration of this conjuncture of time, not being favourable to Us? Or lastly, is it the fault of the Cause rather than of its Advocat? Sir, you may say what you please of it; as for me, I esteem that there is something of all that in it, and you will perhaps be of my opinion, when you shall have made together with me the following Reflections, which will give more light to the Reasons, which make me judge, that that Work of his hath not met with among Us, nor possibly even among the*

sincerer

sincerer sort of your party, those Applau-ses, and that Approbation, which you exspected from it.

The

The First Reflexion.

THe Book of Monsieur *Arnaud* is very big, and this hath been the first stumbling stone, many persons being unwilling to buy it, some by reason of its great price, and others, because they had not so much time to read it. I know many of both Religions, who never had it, upon either the one, or the other account; and it is certain, that ten times more of them would have been sold, if the Book had been of the price and bigness of his first Work. And indeed, Sir, so big a Volume scareth people, and they dare not undertake to read it, that they may not be oblieged to quit it in the middle, and possibly sooner,

ſooner, by reaſon of the ſeveral occupatio[illegible] we all have. Beſides, Monſieur *Arnaud*, me[illegible] thinks, hath had but little care of our ſalvat[illegible] on; for, this Book being, in his opinion, an[illegible] in that of his approbators, a plain and enti[illegible] conviction of us, and an eaſie means to reduc[illegible] us into the boſom of their Church, is it not true, Sir, That his zeal for ſo great a work ſhoul[illegible] have obliged him to have made it more common, more popular, more eaſie to buy, and to read it? What doth he know, whether o[illegible] hundreds of perſons, who have not ſeen hi[illegible] Book, and who would have read it, if it had been much leſs, the half, or the third part, would not have been converted? What doth he know, whether *Tyre* and *Sidon* would not have repented, if they had ſeen the Miracle[illegible] that have been done in *Chorazim* and *Bethſaida*? So that, methinks, he ſhould have ſo ordered it, either by a gratuitous impreſſion, or by retrenching three parts of four of his Book, that all ſorts of perſons might have got it.

It may be, Sir, you will think this, what I ſay of a gratuitous Impreſſion, ſomewhat new and difficult to practiſe. But, if you conſider, that thoſe Gentlemen of the *Port Royal* have made above Five hundred preſents of this Book, according to the relation of their Stationer, will not you avow to me, that, ſince the converſion of thoſe that ſhall read it is concerned, thoſe preſents would have been better employed for the Salvation of Men,

than

han for the payment of a civility, which aim-th but at the honor of the World? Heaven hould have carried it from Earth, and Cha-ity from Interest, whereto we are oftner car-ied by Custom, rather than by Inclination. And do not tell me, that this Book hath been iven to Catholicks, to confirm them in their Religion: For you do not doubt, that almost none of those, to whom it hath been present-ed, had any need at all of these elucidations, nor any scruple of their Belief. You know also, that the Shepherd in the Gospel leaves his Ninety and nine sheep, of which he is as-sured, to go and seek after that one which is gone astray. And if those Gentlemen had pleased, they might have made Presents, and given Alms, acquitted themselves of the du-ties, which respect and friendship demanded of them, and gained good will among their Ad-versaries. You see well enough, Sir, that I speak for the interest of our people, and for many, who would have been very glad to have seen this Book, and were not in a condition to buy it, nor to read it after they had got it.

But let us set aside this Liberality and this Zeal; they are works of supererogation, to which a Man is not obliged; and when meer Counsels do cause trouble, pain, and some loss, we do easily exempt our selves from them. But as to the second condition, which I would have wished from Monsieur *Arnaud*, *viz.* The shortning of his Book, to make it more

more common amongst us, he cannot blame it forasmuch as it would have turned both to his own account, and to that of others, since it would have taken off half his pains in composing it, as well as that of ours in reading it.

Do not think, Sir, that this retrenchment would have taken away any thing of the force of Monsieur *Arnauds* Book; on the contrary, it would have contained nothing but what is essential and solid, whereas in the condition it is now in, it may be said in the general, that it is weak and useless throughout. For, it doth not bear it self up equally; he often tells us one and the same thing, which hath nothing but an amplification, and a paraphrase of his Refutation; and he gives us several useless and impertinent discourses. I believe, Sir, you your self have perceived this truth, and it were not difficult to make it out to any who should doubt of it. In short, the first Book might be reduced to a Douzen Lines, instead of the Twelve Chapters it contains. For, since it was onely written to *Justifie the Method of the Book of the Perpetuity*; that is to say, to Justifie, that the Author had not been obliged to answer to the whole Book of Monsieur *Aubertin*, and might have followed *The way of Prescription, rather than that of Discussion*; It was sufficient to observe so much in three or four words, since that is a matter of common sense, and without controversie: Nor hath Monsieur *Claude* blamed that method further

ther than to shew, that it is not so sure as other; but he hath not omitted to stick to same, and to answer to it exactly: So that was to no purpose, to go about to multiply arrels, and to write a Book, to prove what d not belong to the Question.

The Four following Books, *viz.* The Second, Third, Fourth, and Fifth, and then the welfth, which do largely treat of the consent f the *Schismatick* Churches with the Church f *Rome*, concerning the points of the *Reality*, f *Transubstantiation*, and of the *Adoration* f the *Eucharist*, are pieces besides the business, and not at all necessary. The first Treaise of the *Perpetuity* touched but one word of t: Monsieur *Claude* in his first writing had nswered to it in Four Lines; in the refutation Monsieur *Arnaud* did somewhat enlarge upon t; which did obliege Monsieur *Claude* to make a longer answer thereto. But all that hath been hitherto done by slight touches, and s it were transiently; whereas now Monsieur *Arnaud* makes it his principal. The thing is (and it is that which hath swelled the Work) that Monsieur *Arnaud* hath not here taken Monsieur *Claudes* sense aright, and labored to verifie that which was not denied him: For he pretends to prove every where, that Monsieur *Claude* hath been in the wrong, in denying that the *Eastern* Churches believe the *Reality*; and almost all the passages, which he alleageth, tend onely to make out the contrary. But, Sir, he hath taken pains in vain, and in this encounter

he

he fights with his own shadow; because it not be found, that Monsieur *Claude* hath nied, that the *Greek* Churches did believe *Reality* in the time of *Pascasius*, or that believe it still: He hath onely maintain that they never believed *Transubstantia* and *Adoration*; which is far differing fr the other. For, although we may well ar from *Adoration* and *Transubstantiation* to *ality*, yet may we not conclude also from *Reality* to *Transubstantiation* and *Adoratio* seeing that the *Lutherans* do reject these t latter; and yet believe, as you do, that th take with the Mouth of the Body, the *Body* and the *true Blood* of *Jesus Christ*. that, if Monsieur *Arnaud* would precisely fute the opinion of Monsieur *Claude*, he m make it his business to prove, That the *Gre* and other *Eastern* Churches have believe *Transubstantiation*, and adored the *Euchari* but this he hath not so much as thought of, a yet hath made a strange noise of what he thereth upon Monsieur *Claude*, though Mo sieur *Claude* hath not said it. And so he ha produced with much pomp and shew su testimonies and allegations, which are not all to the purpose of that contest, which is b twixt them.

But it may be, Sir, you will not believe upon my word, and you will hardly persuad your self, That Monsieur *Arnaud* shou have deceived himself in a matter of this n ture, where there needs no more but to rea

is therefore just, I should make this good to you, and alledge before you those passages, where Monsieur *Claude* speaks of it, because you have told me, That you have not seen his first writing. It is therefore this, what he hath maintained: *There remains onely for me to say a word touching the opinion of the* Greeks, *and of the other Christians, which the Author saith, do agree with the* Roman *Church; which is, That I maintain, that Transubstantiation, and the Adoration of the Sacrament, are two things unknown to the whole Earth, except the* Roman *Church; for neither the* Greeks, *nor the* Armenians, *nor the* Russians, *nor the* Jacobites, *nor the* Æthiopians, *nor any other* Christians, *but those that submit themselves to the Pope, believe any thing at all of those two Articles.* This is all he saith of it in that place; where you see plainly, that he speaks not a word of the *Real Presence*, and that he confines himself to the two points of *Transubstantiation* and *Adoration*. And after the same manner doth he declare himself in his Answer to the Second Treatise of the *Perpetuity*, the Second Part, the Eighth Chapter, *viz. I should have nothing more to do concerning this, if the Author had not, as he hath, called in to his succors the* Schismatick *Churches; but since he hath thought fit to joyn the question of their condition, with that of the condition of the* Latins, *it is just to satisfie him also in that. I said therefore about the end of my Answer, that the Adoration of the Sacrament is a thing, wherewith the whole world is unacquainted, ex-*

 cept

dept the Roman *Church*, &c. And in the Sequel of that Chapter, he answers to what Monsieur *Arnaud* had alleaged upon the subject of the *Adoration*; and this is one of the Points denied by Monsieur *Claude*. Of the other, viz. *Transubstantiation*, he speaks in his *third part*, the eighth Chapter, where he examines the proofs of Monsieur *Arnaud*, but he speaks no where of the *Manducation* of the *Body of Christ*; and if he saith sometimes (which is very seldom) that the *Greeks*, or the *Fathers*, have not believed the *Real Presence*, he presently explains himself, calling it afterwards, the *Local Presence, and such an one as is believed at* Rome, to shew, That he speaketh onely of the *manner* of *Manducation*. But itis time, to run through the other Books of his Volume.

The Sixth may be reduced to a most certain, and most evident Proposition, which is, That the words which express what is to be believed of the Eucharist, *have always been explained by Believers, either in a Literal Sense, or in a Metaphorical Sense, and that therefore the Church hath always distinctly believed, either the* Real Presence, *or the* Real Absence. These are the words of Monsieur *Arnaud* in the *Preface*; whereupon he adds afterwards, *That none other perhaps than Monsieur* Claude *would have obliged him to treat of this point, and that every man of good sense must agree in it at first sight.* Whence you see, Sir, that instead of this Sixth Book, there needeth onely four or five Lines, according to the acknowledgment of Monsieur

Arnaud

Arnaud; and that the sole wilfulness of Monsieur *Claude* hath been the cause of this length. But if this wilfulness is imaginary, if Monsieur *Claude* hath not onely agreed to, but also positively maintained, what Monsieur *Arnaud* imputeth to him to have denied, is it not true, That we ought also to cut away this Sixth Book as useless, and supposing a thing which is not? But it is easie to verifie this last Proposition, in the two parts of the Note of Monsieur *Arnaud*: One knows not, whether he accuseth Monsieur *Claude* for having denied the principle he puts, and the consequence; or, whether he accuseth him onely for having demed the sequel, although he agree about the principle; that is to say, One knows not, whether he will say, that Monsieur *Claude* would not acknowledge that the words, *This is my Body, this is my Blood*, have been always taken in the Literal Sense, or in the Metaphorical Sense, and that consequently Believers have always had a distinct belief of the *Presence* or *Absence Real*? Or, whether he meant onely, that Monsieur *Claude* agreeing about the *Thesis*, hath denied the Consequence which Monsieur *Arnaud* draws from it. For his words relate to both these parts; yet I will believe, that Monsieur *Arnaud* hath onely thought of the Consequence, since the whole Book of Monsieur *Claude* speaks of nothing else, but of the Metaphorial Sense of the Sacramental words, and that particularly the fourth, fifth, and sixth Chapters of the Second

Part, are onely spent to evince, *That the Ex-pressions of the Fathers, calling the* Eucharist *the* Body of Christ, *could be taken in no other, but a Metaphorical Sense.*

Let us see therefore, whether Monsieur *Claude* hath denied, that Believers have al-ways had a distinct belief of the *Presence* or *Absence Real*, as Monsieur *Arnaud* imputes to him in his whole Sixth Book. For my part I know not, whether I mistake, but methinks that Monsieur *Claude* hath maintained the con-trary in many places. In his first Answer (*Pag.* 9) he saith; *The Body of Christ is be-lieved to be present in the* Eucharist *four manner of ways:* And after he hath explained them he adds, *And all the ways of Presence are Real, each in its kinde or order: This truth hath been always believed, and is so still.* And after-wards in his Fifth consideration, which hath been the principal subject of the dispute upon this matter, he saith (*Pag.* 12) *Before the Transubstantiation came into the World, every one believed, That Jesus Christ is present in the Sacrament, and that his Body and Blood are there really received by the Believing Communi-cants.* But in the Third Chapter of his Se-cond Answer, you have two precise passages *Thus when the Author tells us* (saith Monsieur *Claude*) *that those who took the Instructions of the Fathers in a Metaphorical Sense, had a distinct and clear Idea of the Real Absence; he means, that they believe Christ to be Corpora-ly Present in Heaven, without thinking on what*

wa

as said afterwards, that he is at the same time in Heaven, and on Earth; there, *after the manner of a Body*; here, *after the manner of a Spirit: To reject formally this opinion, I avow, that Believers had in that sense a very distinct idea of the Real Absence.* And afterwards (*Pag.* 273.) he maintains that in the first Eight Centuries, *The Positive Doctrine, which we believe, was then taught so clearly, strongly and distinctly, that it dispelled all the difficulties, which could arise from these Expressions*; *The Bread is the Body of Christ, the Bread is changed into the Body of Christ.* Is not this enough, Sir, to prove that Monsieur *Claude* hath not maintained, as Monsieur *Arnaud* imputes to him, That for the space of a thousand years, people knew not what the *Eucharist* was, and that Believers had not a distinct knowledge of the *Real Presence* or *Absence*.

But if you suspect Monsieur *Claude*, if his words, his protestations, his complaints are not sufficient to you, I shall furnish you with a witness which you will not reject, and that is Monsieur *Arnaud* himself, who hath written the Fourth Chapter of this Sixth Book purposely to prove, That Monsieur *Claude* (*Pag.* 551.) *hath entangled himself in two considerable faults*; *the one is, that he hath explained his sentiment amiss*; *and the other, that he hath granted him in effect all he desired.* By the first, he pretends that Monsieur *Claude* hath not refuted what was the Question, and that he hath indiscreetly carried the Dispute to the

distinct belief of *Transubstantiation*, which he did not think upon; since he onely thought on the *Real Presence*, separate from all the difficulties, which the circumstances and the way of this *Presence* may beget. By the Second he maintains, that Monsieur *Claude* grants in the matter of the *Real Presence* or *Absence*, all what is sufficient to his design.

Thus you see a truth avowed by both parties. Monsieur *Claude* hath disputed against the distinct belief of the *Transubstantiation*, and Monsieur *Arnaud* hath never maintained this distinct belief. Monsieur *Arnaud* hath maintained the distinct belief of the *Real Presence*, and Monsieur *Claude* grants it, even by the acknowledgment of his Adversary. What need then, to examine at large the Systeme of Monsieur *Claude*, since it clashes not with the Sentiments of Monsieur *Arnaud*? And to what purpose, to make a Book to prove, *That there hath always been in the Church, a distinct belief of the Real Presence*, if Monsieur *Claude* hath not denied it; if he hath strongly stood up for it, at least for the space of the first Eight Centuries; and if he hath spoken onely of *Transubstantiation* in reference to the Ninth and tenth? But let us pass on to the other Books.

The Positive proofs, saith Monsieur *Arnaud* in his *Preface*, *That have been alleaged in the Seventh and eighth Book, to show, That the belief of the Real Presence, and of Transubstantiation was established in the Greek*

Church

Church, and in the Latin, in the eighth, ninth, and tenth Centuries, are onely Accessary proofs, and such as we might be altogether without. We shall not quarrel with him concerning this, we being much of his minde, that these two Books might have been very well spared. And so he would have obliged us in retrenching them.

There is onely the Ninth, which is Essential, continues Monsieur *Arnaud, because it shews the impossibility of the Change; and yet in this Book there are things, which are not necessary but to confound the stubbornness of Monsieur* Claude, *and which an Adversary of more sincerity than he, would have saved us the pains of writing.* So that the whole Volume of Monsieur *Arnaud* might have been reduced to this Ninth Book, and even of this somewhat might have been pruned away.

The Tenth (so goes on Monsieur *Arnaud*) *contains some useful consequences, but such as are onely designed for a further clearing of the truth.* But if these consequences be of use, yet the Book is very useless, because it contains nothing but what hath often been said before; and that, besides that in each Chapter Monsieur *Arnaud* shews the sequels of his Examen and Ratiocinations, each Book hath at the end a Chapter express, which contains the breviate, the Conclusion and the Consequences; or, if you will, one Book contains the Consequences of two or three precedent ones. And so this Tenth Book can

be nothing else but a tedious Repetition of what hath been very often alleaged.

As for the Eleventh, Monsieur *Arnaud* saith nothing of it, and he hath reason, it being a piece, which serveth not at all to the main subject of the contest, and regards onely Personal Complaints, wherein *Readers* are but little concerned.

The

The Second Reflexion.

T is ſtrange enough, that M. *Arnaud* hath taken the pains of compoſing a Volume of hundred and fiftyſheets, of which not ſo ch as the tenth part is abſolutely neceſſary, I have ſhew'd from his own words; and at yet he hath not been willing to terminate at famous Controverſie, which keeps both arties in exſpectation, and hath referred the ſwer to one part of M. *Claude's* Book to nother time.

He giveth us notice of this deſign even in s very Preface, and declareth himſelf parti-larly about it in the ſecond Book, the firſt hapter; *His Book*, ſaith he, in ſpeaking of e Book of M. *Claude*, *Is properly the mix-ure of two Books, of which the one reſpects the reatiſe of the Perpetuity, the other, the common auſe of the Church. He hath blended and con-unded them out of deſign, and we ſhall di-inguiſh them out of a contrary deſign. We ſhall herefore repreſent firſt, the proofs of the Book of he Perpetuity, and the preciſe Anſwers he makes hereto: which ſhall be the ſubject of this Vo-ume, and ſo contain the Anſwer to his firſt Book. And we ſhall reſerve for a ſecond Volume, what e alledges in general againſt the cauſe of the Church, and what the Church alledges againſt*

the

the Doctrine of the Calvinists; which shall m the Answer to his second Book.

Truely, Sir, 'tis to abuse ones leisure, give us accessary proofs, and such as we can without, of things not essential, of con quences said over and over again; and yet divide the Book of M. *Claude* into two par for to Answer but to one of them, in a Bo ten times as big. It had certainly been m better, to have omitted the things which we not absolutely necessary, and to have tak pains in the main, and in the essentials.

And 'tis this management of M. *Arnaul* which hath been the second reason, why m have not been so earnest to have his Boo and which hath not so greatly satisfied Peopl because they expect the second Volume as t most important.

For, what advantage soever M. *Arna* may attribute to his method of Prescription which he hath examined in this first Volume that of Discussion, which he reserveth for t other, is the most sure, and the least perple ed; the inconveniencies, which he findes *this*, being *found* in *his*, because *that* is to ex min the reasonings he alledgeth to show t impossibility of the change, which we prete to have hapned in the time of *Paschasius* in t belief of the Eucharist; and it must discu besides the proofs which we produce to evinc that all the World was not, as he pretends, the sentiment of *Paschasius*, and that he h many Adversaries.

So that, if there be difficulties and prolixi-
ty to know aright the belief of the Fathers in
is matter, for as much as *some want that ne-
ssary help of profiting thereby, which is the un-
rstanding of Tongues; others have not leisure
make this examen with a reasonable care and
eatness; and others have not reach enough to
mpare so many proofs together*, as Monsieur
Arnaud saith; Why will not he admit,
at the same obstacles are found in his Me-
od? Have the Simple and Ignorant, for
hose sake it hath been principally brought to
ght, the knowledge of Tongues, which is ne-
essary to learn the History of the time of
Paschasius, and of the opinion of the Greeks
nd Latins? Have they more leisure to make
his examen with a rational care, then that of
he sentiment of the Fathers of the six first
Centuries? Have they capacity enough to
compare the proofs, which he and M. *Claude*
hall produce in their Books; and not enough
o compare the proofs of the *Cardinal du
Perron*, and M. *Aubertin*?

Sir, I must needs confess my ignorance, and
I understand not the difference there is be-
tween the difficulties of these Methods; on
the contrary, I find, that that of M. *Arnaud*
hath *two* things to clear, whereas the other
hath but *one*; For, that of *Prescription* must
examin the force and truth of the reasons up-
on which 'tis grounded, and besides examins as
well as that of *Discussion*, the passages of many
Greek and Latin Authors, which were necef-

sary

ſary to be alledged by both ſides, to know verity of the ſuppoſitions of this Book of P *petuity*.

But then, it is certain, that what remains be done by M. *Arnaud*, is much more imp tant than what he hath done; for, a man re ſons very ill of the impoſſibility of a thing when another proveth, that the thing hath act ally been done. M. *Claude* maintains, th there hath been made a Change in the D ctrine of the Euchariſt, and that the Antie Church was of our belief; which he will prov by the Writings of the Fathers of that time And M. *Arnaud* imagines, that we may ſatis fie our ſelves upon bare reaſonings, by whic he pretends to prove the impoſſibility of th Change. You ſee, Sir, that *We* go naturally t work, to know whether the thing have hap pen'd, when there are great appearances fo it, when our men do poſitively maintain it and offer proofs to evince it; and, that i ſuch a caſe as this we do little hearken t thoſe, that will perſwade us by ſome abſtrac and Metaphyſical ratiocinations, (havin need of proof) that the thing could not b done.

Add thereto the evident advantage of th proof of this fact above the Method of Pre ſcription, which is, that there is never an end in Ratiocinations. Our mind is too fierce to confeſs it ſelf overcome by the wit of ano ther; it acknowledges no Superiors in thi kind of diſputes, and alwayes finds anſwers

whethe

ether true or apparent, to disentangle it f, either in the difficulty of the question, or the strength of our wit, or in the weakness that of our Adversary: whereas we do ore easily acquiesce in the truths, which the her Method teacheth us, because in that case do not yield to the reasoning of our adver- ry, but to the authority of the Antient hurch, and to the Testimonies of the Fathers, ho assure us of the practice and doctrine of eir time, and by that means of the true nse of the Passages of the Scripture, which e contested.

The

The Third Reflexion.

THat Imperious and Insulting way, wher M. *Arnaud* deals with M. *Claude* eve where, is none of the least reasons, which ha kept our People from reading his Boo There are found in it at every turn injur and expressions of contempt; and it seem that his Treatise was made on purpose t paint him in the blackest colours, that can b used for the picture of the most extravaga of men. He doth perpetually descend fro the Cause to the Person, and without staying as other Authors do, to refute in particul what is oppos'd against him, he presently fal upon the genius, spirit and humour of M *Claude*, of which he taketh pleasure to dra an odd Picture; so that, if he be to be b liev'd, there never was a Writer more extra vagant, more ridiculous, more absurd, mor deceitful, and more prevaricating, than M *Claude*. If I should give you the collectio I have made of the fine qualities, which M *Arnaud* gives him, I assure my self, that yo would startle at it, and I perswade my sel even of the sincerity of M. *Arnaud*, that if h saw this pourtrait, he would disown it, an blame the heat of the dispute, which hat made him write so many things contrary to hi profession, and to the Laws of Christianity. I shall only give you here a pattern of it, b

which

hich you may judge of the whole Piece. It in the first Chapter of the seventh Book, p. 14, where speaking of the *genius* of M. *Claude*, e hath these words: *His Spirit* (of M. *Claude*) *, as by divers Experiments we have already een able to discover, never to regard how things rs in deed, but only how he would desire they hould be; to have no respect to truth, nor so much as to probability, but only to the interest of his cause; to dispose of Histories and real Events with more liberty, then men dispose of the Chimerical adventures of Romances; to build upon the vacuum of his imagination, as upon the most real and the most solid foundation; not to stick to make all the World speak and think madly, so they do but speak and think according to his desires and pretensions; to preferr the most petty reasons to the strongest and clearest proofs; and, to propose and deliver all that in a fierce, bold, contemning and insulting manner; by giving to himself such applauses, as he would gladly receive from others, and treating his Adversaries, as he would that others should treat them.*

Some do imagine, that there are secret reasons, that have obliged M. *Arnaud*, thus to exceed the bounds that ought to be in the Disputes of Learned Men. I will not dive into them; but I am assured, that those transports are not alwayes equitable, and because I have examined the cause thereof carefully, I would show you two or three examples of it, if it were not besides the subject of this Discourse, nor an undertaking of what is M. *Claude*'s province,

province, who hath the Pen in hand to
fend himſelf, and needs no Second.

But, at leaſt you will not think it ſtra
that we are ſcandalized to ſee the publick
fendant of our Cauſe ſo evil entreated,
that this manner of proceeding gives us a
opinion of that which is maintain'd by
Arnaud.

Th

The Fourth Reflexion.

IF we have cause to be concerned for Monsieur *Claude*, this observation will show, That we have a more sensible interest, and which more directly relates to us all, considering it concerns the generality of our Churches. And indeed, Sir, I was surprised to see, that Monsieur *Arnaud* makes a stay to reproach us with the irregularities of the first Authors that forsook their Communion, and to wrangle about their Mission, in a Book which hath nothing at all to do with that; besides that he knows, that we have answered a thousand times those ungrounded Objections.

But there is more than this, which is, that Monsieur *Arnaud* fathers those opinions upon us, which are none of ours, and goes about to decry our Religion from Consequences, which he deviseth at pleasure, or which he borrows from those, who have invented them. I will onely relate to you Three Examples of them.

In the Third Chapter of the First Book, pag. 19. He weaves a prolix Discourse, to shew, that we have no short way of knowing the true Church, and that a man must examine in particular all the Points that are proposed. It is not difficult to answer what he saith

thereupon, but I leave that to Monsi
Claude, who will not fail to make it out, Th
the way of the Scripture is much more ea
shorter, and surer, than that of the Chur
by the very acknowledgment of many of th
own Doctors. I onely note, that in that R
tiocination he accuseth us as if we believe
That it is possible, that the Church shou
subsist no more. Whence he infers, That
cannot avoid discussing all the Dogmes of
Sects, present and passed, subsistent and e
tinct, and to search in the Catalogue of
the Heresies, Whether we may not finde the
the Church of *Jesus Christ*.

I know not, what may have made Monsie
Arnaud to impute unto us such a pretty Vis
on: But this I know, that never any man
our Communion hath said it, and I challeng
Monsieur *Arnaud* to shew me one onely Au
thor amongst us, who hath believed, that i
could come to pass, that the Church shoul
subsist no more. We believe just the contrary,
and know, That the World doth not subsi
but upon the accompt of the Church; tha
there hath never been a moment, and tha
there never will be any, to the end of th
World, wherein it can be said with truth, tha
there is no true Church. *Jesus Christ*, who
cannot lie, hath promised to be with us to th
end of the World, and to secure his Churc
against the power of Hell. We say indeed,
That some of the parts of this Universal
Church can perish, and that that Eternal Sub-
sistence

ence is not fastned to the Church of *Rome*, r the *Grecian*, nor the *Æthiopian*, nor to her particular Members; we have too sad experience to doubt of it. We say also rther, That the true Church hath her degrees Light, as the Moon; that she is at times oppressed by Tyrants, and so obscured by e darkness of Errors, that one can hardly iscern her; and that a great Prophet cryed ut, That he was alone remaining in the midst Idolaters, when God answered, to comfort im, That he had reserved Seven thousand ouls, that had not bowed their knees to *Baal*. ut these things conclude nothing against the xistence of the Church, and Monsieur *Ar-aud* is much out, when he saith, That, according to us, it is possible, she should subsist o more.

He hath no more reason in another place of is Work, (in the Tenth Book, *chap. 1. pag. 6.*) here he saith, That we have introduced mongst us *Detestable Morals, which constitute n essential part of our Religion.* I profess to ou, Sir, that I could hardly believe my own yes; I imagined, that they failed me, or hat the Printer had mistaken: I read it over nd over, an accusation so heinous, so scan-alous, so ungrounded; and with all that, I ould not resolve to believe, that such a hought had escaped a clear-sighted, wise, and ncere man, and one that so much preacheth p Integrity and Candor: But I was yet much ore astonished, when I was assured, that he

was at work to publish our Morals; that as the first Book we shall see of him, and t he pretends to justifie, that they are such, he hath described them here in short.

Sir, you are one of his Friends, cou him to employ his time better, and to le such calumnies to those base and ridicul Spirits, those Quacks of Religion, those norant Methodists, the Cutlers, Apothecar &c. that are the famous Disciples of *Veron.* Tell him, that a Doctor of the *Sor* ought not to amuse the World with such tri and fictions; that it becomes him to be m serious, and to say nothing, but what he c clearly prove.

I know not, how he will order himself making this Book; but I am very well assur that, in what manner soever he compose it, most simple will presently discover the we ness; the honester sort, even of their Relig on, will look on it with contempt; and it w work nothing amongst us, and his reputati will but suffer the more by it.

Yet I doubt not, but the Book will se we do naturally love Detractions and Nov ties; and when Monsters are not in a con tion to hurt us, they commonly excite c curiosity. The Book will certainly have t advantage, that it will teach us things we kn not.

But, Sir, whence may Monſieur *Arnaud* ve this new Light? where hath he made this w Diſcovery? How comes he to ſee amongſt what never any one of ours hath ſeen; d how comes it to paſs, that we have not en aware of theſe *Deteſtable Morals*, of ich he ſpeaketh ſo poſitively? Whence mes it, that none of thoſe, that have for-ken our Communion, and liſted themſelves yours, never thought on it to accuſe us of at Looſneſs, nor have taken for a Motive of eir Change, ſuch *Deteſtable Morals*? Whence mes it, that your moſt famous preachers ſearch ith care, and read with eſteem, the Sermons Monſieur *de Moulin*, Monſieur *Meſtrezat*, onſieur *le Faucheur*, Monſieur *Daillé*, Mon-eur *Gache*, and other Miniſters, without ving there found, what Monſieur *Arnaud* proaches us with, although thoſe writings do cifly treat of Manners? Whence comes it, at even our Fellow-Citizens of your Relig-n, that your Magiſtrates have hitherto made complaint of our Converſation? How omes it to paſs, that the Edicts of His moſt hriſtian Majeſty have not thundred againſt oſe *Deteſtable Morals*? And how is it, that ey ſuffer in the Kingdom ſuch a pernicious regularity, and a *Religion*, which for its ſſential part hath Morals of that nature?

Truly, Monſieur *Arnaud* hath made a range ſtep, and he ſaith too much to be be-eved. For the crime, which he chargeth us ith, is the blackeſt and the moſt execrable

that can be imagined, and never was so m
said of the most barbarous and the most
pious Nations. There are among Heat
some infamous people, who glory in what
call *Vice*, and know not what we call *Vert*
but those Crimes are not authorised by La
and are no Essential part of their Relig
They are people, whom the Justice of G
giveth over to the disorders of their corr
ed nature, and who even sin not in many th
they do, because they have no knowledge
rule, to direct them what they ought to do,
to avoid: But that Christians, enlightned
the Light of the Gospel, should make p
fession of *Detestable Morals by a princip*
their Religion, is so surprising, that I can
hold telling you again, that I can hardly c
ceive, how Monsieur *Arnaud* came to fall
to such a delusion, as to believe and sp
it.

When he is maintaining against us, that
Senses and our Reason are mistaken in the m
ter of the *Eucharist*, he is not the onely m
that maintains it; their whole Church saith
same thing! And to prove this Propositi
he alledges the Power of God, the Tex
the Holy Scripture, and the Testimonie
the Fathers; but here Monsieur *Arnaud* g
about to do something more; for with
proof, and without miracle he will, that
Senses and our Reason are perpetually go
astray; and although we read and hear th
Exhortations to Piety, Holiness, and Repe
an

nce, he will that these things speak nothing of hat they speak, and that this is nothing but *Detestable Morality.*

I know, that certain Spirits of the meanest rank have drawn ridiculous consequences out of some of our Tenents, and accused us, That we make God the Author of Sin; that we make all Sins equal; that we deny the necessity of good Works; that we Preach Libertinism, and the infallible assurance of Salvation, how sinful soever we be; but none hath been yet found, that hath gone so far, as to affirm in general, that our *Morals are Detestable.*

But I must confess to you my being surprised on this occasion: I have, without thinking on it, put Monsieur *Arnaud* among these Spirits of the last rank, who feed onely on poisons, and who cannot speak of their Adversaries, without making Satyres: For after I had written, what you have just now read, I have found a passage in his Ninth Book (*Chap.* 9. *p.* 931.) which confirms what I have told you, touching the design of Monsieur *Arnaud* of writing our Morals, and teacheth me part of the Principles, upon which apparently he must build this great Work.

He speaks in that place of Penitential Exercises, and saith, *That it is not to be wondred, that they seem vain and superstitious to the* Calvinists, *that is, to a sort of people who are assured of their Salvation, who believe that their greatest irregularities do not make them loose the quality*

of being the Children of God; and that altho *they wallow in the shamefullest disorders, t* *are nevertheless as Just as the* Blessed Virgi *their pretended imputative Righteousness not* *ing susceptible of* plus or minus, *of more or le* And somewhat after that, he saith again, *T* *we believe the Penitential Works to be usel* *both to satisfie for the sins passed, and to ass* *us of our Salvation; of which we esteem* *selves to be sure already without repentance* *good works.* And as he is not a man to advan things of this nature without proof, he assure us in the *Margent, That all these accusations sh* *be made good in an express Treaty.*

Thus what I was told, that he was busie writing our Morals, is found true, and the execution of what he hath promised i this place. And it appears also by these Sp cimens, that he will draw up against us t same accusations, which I have just now spok of.

Indeed, Sir, this is intolerable, that Mo sieur *Arnaud* should so licentiously abuse t credit he hath gained, that he should go abo to imitate troubling Busi-bodies, and to wa rant such impertinent calumnies, which hav been so often and so solidly refuted? Doth h not know, that in matter of accusation, ba suspition and apparences are not sufficient, an that there must be positive proofs, and as cle as the Sun? Doth he not remember what him self hath said (in his Second Book, *Chap.* 6 *p.* 153.) *That we ought well to distinguish* *twe*

ceen Consequences, and Tenets formally main-ined. For it cannot be concluded, That those o maintain an opinion, maintain all the con-uences of it, if those consequences are ill de-ced; and although they were well deduced, it not just to impute them to them, if they advow em not, and it do not appear, that they have en them, and approved of them.

Let Monsieur *Arnaud* take his measures y his own Maxim, let him in the Examen of ur Morals alledge none, but our clear and rmally maintained passages, without petti-oggery, without equivocation, and without onsequences drawn after his phancy; and I m sure, that, if he will keep within these ounds, as he is obliged to do, his Book will e soon made, or rather not be made at ll.

In the mean time, Sir, although I believe, hat you are too intelligent to have made any ll judgment of our Morals, upon the Autho-rity, or rather the Passion of Monsieur *Ar-naud*, I shall, by way of anticipation, in a ew lines refute the Book he is writing of them, and to shew you the places whence he must take, what we believe in this matter.

We have therefore no other Morals than those, which *Jesus Christ* hath taught us; and the Prophets and Apostles are our *Casuists* and Doctors, which we consult in all our difficul-ties. The sum of these Morals is, To love God with all our heart, with all our soul, with all our thoughts, and our neighbor as our selves,

selves, not doing to others what we would have done to us.

The Authentick Acts, wherein we explain at large our Sentiments in this matter, are our Confession of Faith, and our Catechism. There it is, Sir, where you may see these Monsters which Monsieur *Arnaud* calls *Detestable*. But I am apt to believe, that he will be alone of his party, and that you will not be of his opinion, when you shall have understood, that there we teach, That God governs and orders all things by his Providence, even the Wicked and Devils.

* In the Confession of Faith, *Art.* 8. *Art.* 8, 22.

* *Without being the Author of Sin, and that their wickedness cannot be imputed unto him, since his Will is the supream and infallible Rule of all equity. That we are regenerated to newness of Life by Faith, which gives us Grace to live holily, and in the fear of God, and which is so far from making us remiss in the duty of a good and holy life, that on the contrary it begets and excites it in us, necessarily producing good Works.* * *That we ought not to take the Name of God in vain, nor speak of him, but with fear and humility:* * *That we ought to mortifie our flesh, and to renounce and deny our selves, that so God may govern us by his Spirit.* * *That we ought to observe the Ordinance instituted in the Church for hearing the Word of God,*

* Catechism. Sect. 25.

* *Ibid.* Sect. 26, 27.

* *Ibid.* Sect. 28, 29, 30.

ed, and having communion in the Publick Prayers and Sacraments: That we ought to obey Father and Mother, honor them, and assist them to the best of our power: That we ought not onely to without all violence and hatred, but love our neighbor, and procure his Salvation with a sincere affection: That we ought to abstain from all impurity, and keep our selves chaste, not onely in deed, but also in our desires, words, and gestures: That we ought not to take an other mans goods, neither by force nor by craft and ill practices: That perjury and evil speaking are sins condemned by the Law of God: That we ought to be so perfect, that not onely evil actions, disorderly affections, and simple desires to sin are blameable, but that even the thoughts, and the simple temptations to evil, although we do not consent thereto, are criminal before the severe Tribunal of Gods Justice.

This, Sir, is the Abridgment of our Morals, that make an Essential part of our Religion; which, I am sure, you will not think *Detestable*, and by it you may see, how great is the transport of Monsieur *Arnaud*, and whether I had not cause to make this injury one of the Motives, which hath made him very suspectful to us, and turned us away from reading his Book: Not to insist now, that he hath given matter to Monsieur *Claude* of a just recrimination, and to examine the Morals of the Jesuits, and that of the Jansenists, which have raised so much noise; together with the Regulations of the Church of *Rome*, for the tax

of

of the Absolution of every sin, of the B of Indulgence, of Dispensations, and t like.

The third Example, which I shall alledg is not less considerable. You know, that t Doctrine of the Gospel consists in these tw points, namely Faith and Repentance; Beli and a good Life. Monsieur *Arnaud* accuse our Morals to be detestable, and he doth n less concerning our Doctrine; since he affirm *That although the Trinity and all the other Mysteries of our Faith be asserted by innumerable, very clear, and very convincing proofs both in Scripture and Tradition, yet these proofs sound very ill in the mouths of the Calvinists, who so weaken them by their false principles, that they make them incapable to perswade the Socinians and all others that are in an error: And one may see, that these detestable Hereticks have done no more but advanced the principles, which the Calvinists have furnished them with, by not enduring to be kept within those arbitrary bounds, to which the first Reformers thought fit to confine themselves: So that this Heresie may in reason be called an Extension of Calvinism.* Those false principles, of which he speaks, are, *That we renounce the Tradition and Authority of the Church, and that we reduce our selves to the Scripture alone, explained by our Reason, and by our private Spirit.*

You cannot but see, Sir, that this discourse is altogether injurious, and that first of all, it insinuates into the mindes of those who read it,

, as if we had a great Conformity with the cinians, and our Religion were an Abridgent of their Heresie, seeing that their Heresie said to be nothing but an Extension of our eligion. Whereas hitherto there hath not een, God be thanked, any contestation bewixt us about these important truths, which hose unhappy men fight against; and the most mpudent calumny never durst quarrel with us pon this point: And our Confession of Faith, our Catechism, the writings of our Doctors against these Hereticks, and all your own writers themselves do highly justifie us. Whence then hath Monsieur *Arnaud* this sullen bitterness? Doth he think, he shall be believed upon his word, and that an accusation of this nature shall be received without proof? He will say, it may be, (and that is all that can be said, somewhat to excuse him;) That he meant not to charge us, as if we did formally maintain the errors of the Socinians about the *Trinity*, but onely, that we have the same principles concerning the Rules of our Faith; that both they and we reject the Authority of the Church; that without this Authority Heretickes cannot be convinced; and that thus, the Socinians being gone out from us, and even having driven farther, than we, this principle, that the Scripture alone is the Rule of Faith, we have furnished them with arms to fight against our most Sacred Mysteries.

But if he would say no more than this, he hath very ill delivered himself, and for so eloquent

eloquent a man as he is, his Discourse ne[illegible] too much comment to make it to be unde[illegible]stood: For a man shall never conclude [illegible] thing else from it, but that we partake of [illegible] Heresie of the Socinians, which is a meer [illegible]lumny; and it is always very ill argued, [illegible] accuse people of all the Errors of those, wi[illegible] whom they have some things common: It [illegible] as if I should say, that the *Roman* Religion [illegible] an extension of the Errors of the Greeks, an[illegible] that it hath advanced their principles, becaus[illegible] both do pray for the dead, and you belie[illegible] a Purgatory, which is not believed by th[illegible] Eastern Churches. It may well be said, tha[illegible] both have some common opinions; but tha[illegible] infers nothing for the rest of their Tenents [illegible] And although the Socinians cut away the Authority of Councils, and of Tradition, from being Rules of Faith, as well as we do, yet it cannot be said without injustice, that their Heresie is an extension of our Belief in general. All that can be concluded from it, is, that we have that principle common; which signifies nothing, forasmuch as there is no Heresie, which hath not something common with the true Church. And not to pass out of our Argument, the Socinians believe and adore one onely God; they believe, and desire Heaven; they believe and fear Hell, as well as we: Is it therefore to be said, that we therefore hold their other Tenents, which we detest and oppose both, with all our power? Certainly Monsieur *Arnaud* hath taken his mea-

sure

re very ill in this matter. But, Sir, you
y observe besides, that he not onely mis-
kes in *this* conclusion, but that the Passion he
d to decry our Religion by such an odious
mparison, hath hindred him to see divers
table faults, upon which he hath built that
nsequence, in such a manner, that there are
rdly more lines than faults in his Ratioci-
tion.

First, It is not true, and it is even dange-
ous to affirm, That the Mystery of the *Trinity*
ath need of Tradition, and of the Authority
f the Church. If the holy Scriptures did
ot clearly assert it, we should always be doubt-
ul, because that Tradition and the Authority
f the Church are not common principles, and
hey have need of a great discussion to be
known.

Secondly, It is not true, that we renounce
Tradition and the Authority of the Church in
his point, nor in many others. Our Confession
of Faith receiveth the *Creeds* of the Apostles,
of *Nice*, and of *Athanasius*; the Councils,
hat have confirmed them, and the Doctors,
hat have maintained them against Hereticks.
We onely desire, that whatever men do say
may be examined by the Word of God, which
is the onely Rule of our Faith, and to which
the Church is subject, according to the Senti-
ment of the Fathers, and the cheif Doctors.
And as to the *private Spirit*, by which Mon-
sieur *Arnaud* saith we believe the Scriptures
are to be expounded, that is a mear *Chimera*,
which

which hath been so often refuted, that it wonder, he should amuse people with kinde of Objections.

Thirdly, It is not true neither, that the cinians do absolutely reject the Councils, the Fathers, nor that they have advanced principles about this point, as Monsieur naud saith; their Books are full of passa of the Antients, which they expound a their way, but they will not suffer that should be opposed to the holy Scriptu Monsieur *Arnaud* himself cites a place *Socinus*, which destroys w he saith here. * *All t things* (it is *Socinus* speaki of the Fathers, and of Councils) *and others of the same kinde are serve men of understanding and good sense, on to let them know, what was the Faith of Church at that time, and to induce them not recede without reason from the Doctrines t were then received: But to go about, resolut to maintain opinions against the clear Testimon of the Scriptures, because the Fathers approve them, is, to endeavor to subvert designedly Divine Truth.*

* The first Book. cap. 5. pag. 42.

Fourthly, The Ratiocination which Mo sieur *Arnaud* maketh upon what I have be examining, is not square, and cannot be mai tained. For though it were true, that w should altogether reject the Authority of Tr dition, and of the Church, since the Socin ans do the same, how do we, by this principle enerva

rvate in respect of them the proofs of the nity? And how can Monsieur *Arnaud* agine, that we should convince them more sily, if we received that Authority, seeing at they reject the same equally? Doth he not ow, that we do not reasonably combat ainst our Adversaries, by *our* principles, but ely by *theirs*, or by *common* principles, in ich they agree with us? So that, maintain-g as Monsieur *Arnaud* doth, that we weaken e proofs of the *Trinity*, by rejecting the thority of the Church, and that if we did ceive the same, we should more strongly op-ose those Hereticks; it is just, as I should say, hat a man who should reject the Gospel, ould weaken the proofs of the Deity and carnation of *Jesus Christ*, in respect of the *ews*; for it is the same thing to dispute ainst the Socinians by Tradition since they nounce it, as to dispute against the *Jews* by e Gospel which they believe not. Before we n act by the authority of a principle, it is cessary, that all the parties should agree bout it, or we must prove the authority of at principle.

Thus you see, that Monsieur *Arnaud*, to ake an odious comparison to our disadvant-ge, hath drawn a false consequence, and built pon false Propositions.

You will say doubtless, that these Reasons, hich regard the out-work of Monsieur *Ar-auds* Book; his particular conduct, his way writing, his resentments, and his personal

differences with Monſieur *Claude*, do weaken the ſubſtance of the truth he th eſtabliſheth, nor the proofs of the Book of *Perpetuity*, and that, that at leaſt muſt h made ſome impreſſion on thoſe, who have the leiſure and care of reading it all; and, you know, that I am of that number, you wo alſo know, what I think of that, and will be content to know onely, what others h ſaid or might have ſaid of it.

It is eaſie, Sir, to ſatisfie you alſo in t point, and I ſhall therefore add to the form *Reflexions*, ſuch other Obſervations as ſhall you ſee, that when Monſieur *Arnauds* Bo ſhall be conſidered onely in its Eſſential pa ſevered from all the Objections I have be examining, the weakneſs of his proofs a reaſonings, (which are, often enough, ve embaruſſing and contradictory) doth there ſo evidently appear, that he could not expe from it a very favorable ſucceſs.

But, Sir, you will remember, if you pleas what you deſired of me, and what I promis you; which is, you know, that I underta not to examine Monſieur *Arnauds* Book *that* concerns Monſieur *Claude* particularly who will acquit himſelf, I am ſure, very w and very generouſly of it. My deſign onely to tell you, what effect this Book hath h amongſt us, and how it hath been received b us, together with the Reaſons in general which have kept it from making that famo progreſs, which you thence exſpected. Wha

hat

ath been obſerved of it already, hath furniſhed Reaſons conſiderable enough, and what am going to note further, will furniſh other ore important ones, becauſe it will more early touch the Ratiocinations of Monſieur *Arnaud* about the Ground of the Defence of is Book concerning the *Perpetuity*.

The Fifth Reflexion.

YOu know, Sir, that the only design of t Book about *the perpetuity of the Faith of Catholick Church concerning the Eucharist*, a of the Treatises which have been written a terwards for its defence by M. *Arnaud*, is shew, that the Change, which *We* say hath ha pen'd in this point, is impossible, and nothi but a Chimera and Fiction of our Ministers.

You know also, that the two Grounds this proposition do consist, in the Union of t Greek Churches (about this point) with t Latin Church at the time, at which we a sign this change, which is in the ninth a tenth Century; and in the Distinct belief, whic all the people of the World had then and be fore, of the Real Presence of the Body o *Jesus Christ* in the Eucharist, in consequence which he was there adored by all Christians.

To speak the truth, this was no ill fetch, a if it were well proved, the consequences which are drawn from thence, would be ve strong: For, it is not to be conceiv'd, th an Innovation of this nature should insensib slide into the Universal Church; that th Greeks, separated from the Latins, shoul have taken new Tenents from these, which th look'd no otherwise upon than irreconcileab enemies; *that* none should have perceiv'd

eith

ther that the one part did no longer adore hat made their chief worſhip, and the prin-pal ſubject of the ordinary Adoration of all ations, *or* that the other part did begin to dore what they were not wont to adore, and hich was nothing but a creature; *or* laſtly, if Change ſo conſiderable had been perceiv'd, hat all the World ſhould have remain'd in lence; *that* no publick complaints ſhould ave been made on one or the other ſide; and *hat* there ſhould have been no Councils aſſem-led to remedy it, as was done when *Beren-er* oppoſed himſelf in the Eleventh Age to he Opinion of the *Roman* Church about this oint.

And therefore M *Claude*, who ſaw very ell, that theſe Principles could not be grant-d without ſome prejudice to him, deny'd hem both, and maintain'd, *that* the Greeks id not acknowledge Tranſubſtantiation, be-auſe this is the only medium you admit to nake men believe the Real Preſence, ſuch as ou receive it; *that Paſchaſius*, the Introdu-er of this opinion, doth not eſtabliſh it but y craft, by keeping the ancient termes, and y way of explication of the Faith of his Pre-ceſſors; *that* the Adoration which is oppo-ed as an invincible *medium* to make people nd the Change, if there had been any, was nknown to the Greeks and Latins of that ime.

But what injurious reproaches hath not M. *Claude* expoſed himſe f to by this denyal? What

What ſtorms and tempeſts hath he not raiſed? The Schooles did never ſo much exclaime against the opinion of the Motion of the Earth. And if he had openly maintained in the Pulpit at *Charenton*, that *Paris* was deſtroyed, and that no more any being in nature; or that 'tis very dark at full noon when the Sun ſhines brighteſt, and the Air is leaſt over-caſt, he could not have been accuſed of a great blindneſs, and a more ridiculous temerity than to advance, that the Greeks did not believe Tranſubſtantiation, the Local Preſence and Adoration, in the ninth and tenth Century, and that they have ſtill the ſame Sentiments. *Indeed*, ſaith M. *Arnaud* on this occaſion, (in his Refutation, *p.* 465.) *'Tis not tolerable to advance evident falſities with that confidence without alledging proofs, and a man can hardly recede more from ſincerity.*

But, if the proofs, he produceth himſelf for theſe two Eſſential points, conclude nothing, and are not neceſſary, neither by our Principles, nor by his own; if he himſelf deſtroys by his own Maxims what hath been eſtabliſhed in his Book of the *Perpetuity*; may we not ſay that his wrath is unjuſt, that he hath enſnared himſelf in his own net, that he evidently contradicts himſelf, that his Book of the *Perpetuity* can produce no effect, and that his defence is weak, and to no purpoſe?

Let us then briefly examine theſe two Capital and ſole Grounds of his Book of the Perpetuity

tuity, and let us refute them by M. *Arnaud*, eir own Defendant.

The *First* consists, as I said, in the Union of e Greeks with the Church of *Rome* about the ucharist in the time of *Paschasius*, whom we firm to have introduced in the Ninth Cen- ry the opinion of the Substantial Presence, d of Transubstantiation; and which got rength, and increased, and diffused it self hrough all the West, during the Tenth Age.

'Tis pretended, that this Change could not e made, because the Oriental Churches had at hat time the same belief which we now oppose, nd which they could not receive from *Paschasius*, nor the *Latin Church*, seeing they had erhaps never heard of the *former*, nor seen his ook, neither were they in a condition to ceive from the latter any Change in their Te- ents, by reason of the animosity which was be- ween these Churches; On the contrary, the Greeks would have been very glad to have ex- laim'd against the conduct of the Latins, if hey had met with so fair an occasion, since hey declared and publisht their demeanour in Writing about far slighter matters.

To destroy this ratiocination, which is trong, if it were true; We have asserted, that neither at the time of *Paschasius*, nor in the following Century, the Schismatick Churches did at all believe Transubstantion, nor the Adoration of the Sacrament. So that, if M. *Arnaud* does not prove this Proposition, the first Pillar of his Edifice in the Book of the

Perpetuity falls to the ground: But, if it b himself that furnishes most of the Instrume to pull down this Pillar, his Enemies w discourse of it sufficiently, and his Friend as you, Sir, and I, who have a great este for him, shall not be able to forbear calli him the Destroyer of his own workmanship.

Let us therefore examine the Proofs h alledgeth of the Opinion of the Orientals, co cerning these weighty points, in the Ninth a Tenth Age; for the Controversie is not o other Ages, and the force of the ratiocinatio of the *Perpetuity*-Book is altogether confine to these two Centuries.

For the *Ninth*, M. *Arnaud* produceth t testimony of *Nicephorus*, Patriarch of *Constan tinople*, of whom he citeth two passages, ta ken out of two of his Treatises against the *Ico noclasts*, (Image-breakers) who called the Brea and Wine of the Eucharist, the Figures an Images of the Body of *Jesus Christ*. The passages are reducible to these four Proposiri ons.

The *First*, That the Image and the thin thereby represented are altogether opposite in so much, that 'tis a folly to maintain, th they are the same thing.

The *Second*, That it sometimes the Brea and Wine were call d the Images and Anti types of the Body and Blood of *Jesus Christ* that was *before* the Consecration.

The *Third*, That *Nicephorus* and the othe Greeks, adversaries to the Iconoclasts, di

not

t call the Oblations designed for the Sacrament of the Eucharist, the Image of the Body Christ, but the Body of Christ it self.

The *Fourth*, That these Oblations are changed to the Body and Blood of *Jesus Christ*, after e same manner as the Bread and Wine are onverted into our substance.

M. *Arnaud* bears himself much upon these xpressions, which are nothing but Copies of e Discourses of the Fathers in the second ouncil of *Nice* against the Iconoclasts; Mean me I am sure, that not only he would be unilling to maintain in earnest any of these our propositions, but also that he directly oposeth them in his Treatise.

The *first*, That the Image is different from what it represents, and that it cannot be granted, that what *Iesus Christ* hath given us to eat, hould be both together his Image and his Body, is a Truth not to be contested, in what sense soever it be taken. *Nicephorus* makes use of it to ill purpose, to prove against the Iconoclasts, that there is in the Eucharist, after the Consecration, neither Figure, nor Image, nor antitype, but only the Body and Blood of *Iesus Christ*, because he believed the *Impanation* of the Word, that is, that the Bread and Wine were personally united to the Body and Blood of *Iesus Christ*, and made one and the same Body and Blood, by this Hypostatical Union.

But M. *Arnaud*, who is not of this opinion, cannot alledge for himself the opinion of this Author,

Author, which agreeth not at all with the Belief of the Roman Church: And therefore he avoweth every where, that there is Figure and Antitype even after the Consecration, and maintains against the position of *Nicephorus* that the Eucharist is Figure and Truth, Image and Body both together.

I know very well, that to save *Nicephorus* and the *Second Council of Nice* blameless, for having condemned their Adversaries, because they had called the Eucharistical Oblations Figure and Image, although according to M. *Arnaud* there was one popular sense of these words, which was exclusive of the verity, and another popular sense, which was not exclusive when they were apply'd to the Eucharist (wherein it would be hard to save himself from a manifest contradiction:) I know very well, *I say*, that M. *Arnaud* supposeth, that at the time of the II. Council of *Nice* and of *Nicephorus*, the word Figure and Image, which was not exclusive of the verity, was very rare, and that therefore the Iconoclasts would not use it, least those expressions should be taken in the other popular sense, which is exclusive of the verity.

To this I answer two things; *one*, that this Distinction of Figure exclusive, and not exclusive of the Verity, was unknown to those Authors (the Adversaries of the Image-breakers,) and to others, who maintain'd, that the Eucharist was not an Image and Antitype: And M. *Arnaud* maketh them think

and

d say, what they never thought nor said; ey never imagin'd this distinction, nor er declared themselves about it, after the anner that M. *Arnaud* would have it; their spute would have been at an end in a mo-ent, or rather there would have been no dis-ute between them, seeing the Fathers of that *ouncil of Nice* and *Nicephorus* had no more to o but to tell the Image-breakers, that it was ue, that the Bread and Wine of the Eucha-ist were Images and Figures of the Body and lood of *Jesus Christ*, but that they were mages which contain'd the Truth it self: their ifference would have been thereby deter-nin'd, since M. *Arnaud* believeth, that the conoclasts did at the bottom agree with their Adversaries.

This therefore is not the sense of the Greeks, who have asserted, that there was no Figure in he Eucharist; but, their opinion was, that here was neither Figure exclusive, nor Figure inclusive; neither Substance, nor Accidents of the common Bread, and that there was no-thing but the Body of *Jesus Christ*, that is, that he Bread was truly his Body by an Hyposta-tical union. And this is evident by all the expressions of those men; which I hope to prove more largely another time.

I answer *secondly*, That the reason, which M. *Arnaud* produceth to excuse *Nicephorus* and the *Council of Nice*, is not true: *These very termes* (of Images, Figures and Antitypes) *being*, saith he, in the seventh Book, Chap. 7. pa. 708;

pa. 708, *become less ordinary, would have* [illegible] *pear'd offensive, because the understanding* [illegible] *ding no more to it, they beget no more but the* [illegible] *of what they precisely signifie; and therefore* [illegible] *is not to be wondred, that the Fathers of* [illegible] *Council of Nice were scandalized at the w*[illegible] Image, *which the Iconoclasts employ'd, because* [illegible] *appears by the Authors of the seventh Age, th* [illegible] *it was but little used in respect to the Eucharist.*

But whence is it that M. *Arnaud* hath learn'd that at that time the Word *Image* applyed to the Eucharist was little used? He cannot produce one only Author for it. For, to say that the Eucharist is not an Image, as *Anastasius Sinaita* doth, that concludes nothing, because that *Anastasius* acknowledged in the Eucharist no Figure at all, neither exclusive nor inclusive; nor did he ever say, that this word *Image* was no more in use in his time, though it had been theretofore; on the contrary, he maintains, that, if the Eucharist have been call'd an *Image*, that was before the Consecration, that is, before it was the Eucharist. And thus *Anastasius* hath been alledged to ill purpose, as also some other Authors that have follow'd him, to prove, that the word *Image*, apply'd to the Eucharist, was little in use, since he denyeth, it was ever used.

Besides, Is not this observation plainly refuted by the *Council of Constantinople*, against which that of *Nice* was called together, since that in this Assembly, composed of more than 300 Bishops, the word *Image* is given to the

Eucharist?

ucharist? Is not such a considerable num-
er of Bishops rather to be believed concern-
ng what was in use in their time, than two or
hree particular Authors? And, if they have
alled the Eucharist an *Image* of the Body and
lood of *Iesus Christ*, is not that a convincing
roof, that the popular sense, which it had in
his respect until then, as M. *Arnaud* will have
t, did obtain still, and that therefore this ex-
ression was blamed to ill purpose by the Fa-
hers of *Nice*, and by *Nicephorus*?

But, let us go no further than to M. *Ar-
naud*, to find the refutation of what he hath
aid concerning this matter; he will free us
rom all pain himself, and furnish us with an an-
wer, which he cannot refuse without disown-
ng his reasons.

You saw but lately in the passage I related
out of him, that, according to his opinion,
e are not to wonder, that the Fathers of the
II. Council of *Nice*, and the Patriarch *Nice-
phorus*, were scandalized at this, that the Coun-
cil of *Constantinople*, held by the Iconoclasts,
had called the Bread and Wine in the Eucha-
rist a Figure and Image; for as much as from
the *Seventh* Age that word was little more in
use as to this matter.

But then M. *Arnaud*, remembring no more
this answer, asserts on the contrary, That we
are in the wrong, when we alledge for our de-
fence *the Passages of the Fathers, wherein the
Symbols are call d by the name of Figure*: And
that we cannot thence conclude, (in his tenth
Book,

Book, cap. 4. pa. 22.) *that therefore the B of Christ is not there inclosed, because, besi that the same Language is found in the seve and eighth Ages, it is found also in the eleve Age, and at the time when they were condemn who denied the Real presence, and yet those, w were the greatest Enemies of the Error of B renger, were neither offended nor scandalized it.*

So that when it pleaseth M. *Arnaud*, t terme of *Figure* and *Image* had no more from the time of the *Seventh* Age, that pop lar sense, which made it to be receiv'd unde the notion of a Figure, inclosing the Truth and therefore the Fathers of the II. Council o *Nice*, and *Nicephorus*, had reason to be scan dalized at it in the *Eighth* and *Ninth* Age; an afterwards when he pleaseth, this same wor was in use in the seventh and eighth Age, an even in the eleventh, and was employed with out any offence or scandal.

This shews sufficiently, how much Passio and eagerness of Victory, whatever it may cost, cloudeth in great Wits the light they had re ceiv'd either from Nature or Grace.

The same proves also, that the *Second* Pro position out of the passage of *Nicephorus*, i not more reasonable: For it is not true, tha the *Symbols* were not call'd by the Fathers An titype, Figure and Image, but only *before* th Consecration; The contrary might easily be proved; but it is needless, since M. *Arnaud* too intelligent not to know a thing of this na

ture,

ure, candidly acknowledgeth the error of *Nicephorus*, and of the Fathers of *Nice* in this matter. See his seventh Book, *Chap.* 7. *p.* 708. and *Ch.* 8. *p.* 717.

The *two last* Propositions, drawn out of the passage of *Nicephorus*, *viz.* That the Bread and Wine are truely and properly the Body and Blood of *Iesus Christ*, and that it becomes such by the vertue of the Holy Spirit, changing these Oblations into the Body and Blood of Christ, even as the Bread and Wine, and Water, are changed into our substance: These two Propositions, I say, will appear to you more formal for your Belief, and more express to prove the intention of M. *Arnaud*; But do not, I pray, stand upon the out-side, nor the Exterior sense of these words; consider them attentively, and you'l find, that these two opinions are as contrary to their Doctrine as to ours.

First, It is not true, according to you, that the Bread is the Body of *Jesus Christ*; and I challenge Monsieur *Arnaud*, to produce me onely one of your Doctors, that approveth this Proposition. On the contrary, all are agreed amongst you, that the word *this*, in this Enunciation of our Saviour, *Take, eat, this is my Body*, doth not signifie, *This Bread*: And when your Writers do alledge the passages of the Fathers, which say, That the Bread is the Body, to prove the Reality, they give explications to this manner of speaking, because it cannot be true, being taken in this sense,

That

That the Bread is the Body; for, it is m certain, *That* the Body of *Jesus Christ* is m made of Bread, *that* the substance of t Bread is not his Body, *that* the Accidem which you take for the Symbols, Signs, Figure and Images of the Body of *Christ*, are not neither, nor indeed can be.

Secondly, What *Nicephorus* saith of t Conversion of the Bread into the Body Jesus *Christ*, after the manner of the change Meat into our Substance, is a meer Parad amongst you, as well as amongst us; the *Tra substantiation* hath nothing like it, and instea of changing the substance of the Bread in the Body of *Christ*, it wholly destroys th Substance, and reduceth it to nothing, t substitute in lieu of it the Body of *Jes Christ*, after an invisible and incomprehensib manner. Thus, Sir, you see, that this fi Testimony of the Belief of the Greeks in th Ninth Age, deposeth nothing in favor of Mo sieur *Arnaud*, since himself dareth not mai tain any one of its Propositions.

This *Reflexion* may serve for Answer t the Second and third Testimony of Monsieu *Arnaud*.

Theodore Abucara, Bishop of the *Latin* speaks like *Nicephorus* (in the Seventh Book o Monsieur *Arnaud*, *Chap.* 9. *pag.* 719, 720. *viz. That the holy Spirit descends upon the Ob lations, and by the Fire of his Divinity, co verts the Bread and Wine into the Body an*

Blo

lood of Jesus Christ, just as the stomach angeth the nourishment into its own Body.

And *Peter of Sicily*, speaking of the *Paulian* Heretics, who said, That instead of ead and Wine, *Jesus Christ* had given nothing t words to be instead of Symbols and Figures, ith, *They deny the dreadful and divine Transstantiation of the Body and Blood of our Lord, hich is made in the Mysteries.* And in another ace, *The Bread*, saith he, *is presented visibly upon Altar, and the Holy Ghost descends invisibly, nsifying the Oblations, and making them, not Antitypes, but the very Body and Blood of r Lord, and our God.*

I grant, that they speak not in these terms *Charenton*, but Monsieur *Arnaud* must also knowledge with the same sincerity, that neier do they speak so in the *Sorbonne*, and that ere they will never say, That after the Conecration there is no Figure and Antitype in e Sacrament, and that the Body of *Jesus hrist* is made of Bread, as our Bodies are ourished and increased by the meat we eat. nd this sufficeth me to shew, That these estimonies are useless to Monsieur *Arnaud*; r, he hath undertaken to prove, That the reek Church was in the Ninth and tenth Ages the same opinion, which now obtains in the hurch of *Rome*, about the *Reality*, *Transubantiation*, and *Adoration*. This is his main oundation, and these Testimonies are not able prove it, because they are not of your opinin, and do believe what you believe not.

 If

If you shall ask me, what then was th Belief in this point, I will tell you, that fi *Anastasius Sinaita*, and possibly before, t Greeks did believe, that the Bread was hyp statically united to the Body of *Jesus Chr* making by this means one and the same Bod as the Body of *Jesus Christ*, united to the D vinity, doth constitute one onely Perso which maketh that we say, Man is God, a God is Man. Some did declare themsel more grosly and more rudely than others, rather carried this opinion to unconceiva extravagancies, and to affrighttul Error For, they believed, that by reason of t Change, and of this Assumption of the Bre into the Body of *Christ*, which made it o and the same Body, this Body of our Savio was seen, felt, eaten, bruised by the Tee and in the Stomach reduced to the conditi of common meat.

These, Sir, are the Testimonies, whi Monsieur *Arnaud* reciteth to prove, that t Greeks in the Ninth Age were of your opin on. Judge you, whether he hath hit well; a let him not say now, that we attribute to t Greeks amiss, the Heresie of *Stercoranism*. hope to shew *that* in another piece; here I sha content my self to prove it by Monsieur *A naud* himself, who contradicts himself in t point so evidently, that I am altogether su prised at his not perceiving it, or that he ha not been advertised of it by so many Learn Bishops, and Doctors of the *Sorbonne*, wh

have

have given him their Approbation with so much pomp, and will perswade us, that they have read his Book very attentively. Indeed, a good advertisement upon that and the like other contradictions, would have been much more advantagious to him, than all their Encomiums. But let us make proof of this Accusation.

Monsieur *Claude* answering the Objection drawn from the pretended union of the *Greeks* and *Latins* in the Council of *Florence*, had said, That if by vertue of this union the *Greeks* seem to have tacitly suffered the *Transubstantiation* of the *Latins*, the *Latins* have likewise suffered the *Stercoranism* of the *Greeks*, and that there was no more reason to conclude from thence, that the *Gresks* are *Transubstantiators*, than that the *Latins* are *Stercoranists*.

Hereupon Monsieur *Arnaud* asserts, (in his Fourth Book, *Chap.*3. *pag.*356.) That this *Stercoranism of the Greeks is a meer Chimera, which hath not any solid ground; that it is true, that* Hubert *had accused* Nicolas *of it, but that that was from a consequence at random, and that there appears not any trace or sign of it in all the Writings of the Greeks.* And some Lines after he affirms, *That it is a thing very false, and very improbable, that the Greeks have held this Error.* He had asserted the same thing before (in his Second Book, *cap.*6.) in answering an accusation of Cardinal *Hubert*, who did object to *Nicolas* this *Stercoranism*, and of

Dalger, who chargeth all the *Greeks* ther with.

But now, as if Monsieur *Arnaud* were a mated by two opposite Spirits, or had lost h memory, he hath changed his minde since h Fourth Book to the Seventh. We are goi to finde him to be in a good understandi with Monsieur *Claude* about this point, a to confirm what just now he called a pu *Chimera*, and a thing very false, and very i probable.

Examining the difficulties, which occur i a passage of *Anastasius*, a Religious Man Mount *Sina*, which he had alledged to ma out the Belief of the *Greeks* of the Seven Age, and not being able to extricate himsel he is constrained, after Monsieur *de Marca*, t grant, that this Author was a *Stercoranist* believing, That the Body of *Jesus Christ* w corruptible in the Sacrament; and he ender vors also to prove, That this was the opinio of *Anastasius*, by comparing other places o the same Author. He alledges the exampl which he had already produced elswhere *that Sicidite Fryar, who taught under the Emperor* Alexius *Junior*, *that the Body of Jesu Christ was corruptible, and who had at th time some Followers*, (in his Seventh Book, *Chap* 2. *pag* 629.) And thence he concludeth, *Th it would not be at all strange, the like thought were come into the minde of* Anastasius Sinaita. He confirms the same thing in his discourse upon the Book of *Bertram* (which is in the

Twelfth

welfth Book of this Volume, *Chap.3. p.33.)* here, speaking of the Belief of those, against hom he thinks *Bertram* had written, and ho imagined, as he esteems, that there was o vail nor figure at all in the *Eucharist*, and at the object of Faith was not distinguished om that of Sense, and that the very Body of *Christ* was properly seen and felt, he adds, *e may gather from divers places of this piece, hat this opinion, though difficult, falls yet naurally enough into the minde, since it seems it is hat of* Anastasius Sinaita, *and of those other Greeks who have said afterwards, that the Body f Jesus Christ was corruptible in the Eucharist; o that there is no cause to wonder, that there were men in the Ninth Age, which understood he Eucharist in the same sence, as it was understood of many Greeks.*

Thus you may see it sufficiently proved, That Monsieur *Arnaud* asserts in one place, hat there have been Greeks *Stercoranists*, and n another, that *Stercoranism* is a *Chimera*, and hat there appears not any trace of it in their Writings. When you see him, Sir, you may sk of him the untying of this contradiction. But let us see, whether the Testimonies of the Tenth Age will be more favorable to him than those of the Ninth, we have been examining.

He reciteth but two of them; but both do favor of the barrenness of the Deserts, whence he hath taken them, and they are useless, and deserve rather pitty than answer.

The first (in the Seventh Book, *Chap.* 9. *pag.* 722. and in the Refutation, *pag.* 243.) is drawn out of an Extract of the Life of an *Anchorite* called *Luc*, who being gone to consult the Archbishop of *Collen*, to know what he should do to receive the Divine Mysteries, that Archbishop answered him, *That if by an inevitable necessity a Priest could not be had upon their Mountain, they must put on the sacred Table the Vessel, wherein the pre-sanctified Mysteries are, then spreading a Linnen Cloth, they must lay down the sacred little parts, and burning incense, they must sing Psalms sutable to the Mystery, or the Canticle called* Trisagion, *together with the Creed; then adoring it by bending three times the knees, and joyning the hands, they shall take with their mouth the sacred Body of Jesus Christ our Lord.* See how Monsieur *Arnaud* hath cited this passage in his Refutation of the First Book of Monsieur *Claude*, where you finde the word *adoring* in bigger Letters to shew the importance of it; and that there in consists the force of the Argument which is taken out of this place. Monsieur *Claude* did complain of it in his Answer, and accused the Author of Falsification, because the word *adoring* is not in the *Greek*.

Is it not true, Sir, that if, before having seen the Book of Monsieur *Arnaud*, this difference had been barely related to you, and you had been well perswaded, that this word which is contested, is not in the Text, you would doubtless have believed at first, that

Monsieur

Monsieur *Arnaud* was too candid not to own frankly, that the *Latin* Interpreters, which he followed, made him err, and that he should have consulted the *Greek* Text in an allegation of that consequence: Yet you may see, that your conjecture would have been in vain, since Monsieur *Arnaud* doth not yield to the truth which he seeth, but labors to confirm this Traduction by windings and turnings, and by subtleties unworthy a man of his understanding and credit.

Let us freely avow, Sir, that the spirit of man is a strange piece; there is no evidence, he will not darken; no darkness, for which he will not pretend to finde light, when he findes himself engaged to maintain what he hath advanced, and believeth, That it were a shame for him to retreat one step in the face of his adversary; but let us avow also, That *truth* hath an admirable power, and if she be not always crowned by the hands of her own enemies, she is often opposed with so much weakness, that it is easie to see her advantage, and withal the perplexities entangling those who resist her motions.

You see here a manifest example. Monsieur *Arnaud* grants, that in the Text there is onely this, *And then bending the knees three times*; and that the word *adoring* is not there; and yet he goes about to maintain this Translation. Is not this an effect of that self-love, which casts away many of the greatest men, and which is never laid down but in our grave?

Can it be the sole passion of contesting with Monsieur *Claude* even of the clearest things? What may have obliged him to be obstinate against such an evidence? Can it be a defect of his understanding, and can he seriously believe, that a Translator hath the liberty that to add to his Text, and so strangely to satisfie it by a paraphrase and an explication of his own phancy, under the pretence of having translated it according to the Sense, and not according to the Letter? Or can he believe that *to bend the knees*, may be faithfully rendred by the word *adore*? You may make such Reflexions upon it as you please; as for me, I am altogether perswaded, that Monsieur *Arnaud* is deceived, and that he saith nothing to maintain his Proposition, but what is extreamly weak. But since I have not undertaken to refute his Book, and that that were to usurp the right of Monsieur *Claude*, I keep my self within the subject of this Letter.

For this purpose, you will please to observe two things, which will shew you the delusion of Monsieur *Arnaud* in the Allegation of this passage.

First, That according to the truth of the Text he concludeth nothing, nor proveth at all the point, for which it is cited

Secondly, That even according to the false Latin Translation, which Monsieur *Arnaud* hath followed, it is alledged to ill purpose, and maketh nothing for the opinion of the *Greeks*.

There

There needs no great discourse to prove these two truths; a little common sense is sufficient to discover their evidence.

For first, all that can be drawn from the true place, is this, That the *Eucharist* is called the Body of *Christ*, and that it is received kneeling. But this is not to any purpose; because, if all those who use this expression and this ceremony, are of your Religion in this point, you will not finde many, against whom the claps of the fulminating Council of *Trent* can be justly directed, in regard that the *Lutherans* receive the *Eucharist* kneeling, and believe they eat the true Body of *Jesus Christ*; and those of our Communion in *England* take also the Sacrament on their knees; and there is not any Protestant person either in *France* or elswhere, who doubts that he eateth and drinks truly and really the Body and Blood of *Christ*: We onely differ about the manner of this Manducation; we distinguish the Sign from the thing signified, and we stick not to give to the Sacrament the name of the Body of *Christ*, conformably to the words of its Institution, the more to note the truth and efficacy of the Union there is betwixt them.

Whence you see, that such kinde of expressions as these, which in the Letter seem more conform to your Belief, are yet not contrary to ours; they have their warrantable use; they are very true according to their intention, and are not at all incompatible with our Sentiments: Which is plainly made out, in

in that we make use of them without scruple and it is a Rule, which Monsieur *Arnaud* has laid down, and for the proof of which he employs the Fourth Chapter of his Tenth Book: That when those, who believe a Doctrine, use terms which are objected to them as inconsistent with their Doctrine, it is an evident mark, That those expressions may stand very well with their belief, and are not in reason to be opposed as being contrary to them. For example, he saith, It is objected to us, that the Fathers have often called the Sacrament of the *Eucharist, the Figure, the Antitypes and Symbols of the Body of Christ*; that they have given it the name of *Bread, Wine, the Fruit of the Vine*; that they have said, it was not *Common Bread*; that they have asserted, that the Body of *Jesus Christ*, which we receive in the Sacrament, is *Spiritual* and *Mystical*. But, notwithstanding all these Conformities with *our* ordinary expressions, Monsieur *Arnaud* esteems not, that they prejudice at all the Sentiment of the Fathers, or that it may be concluded from thence, that they did not believe the *Reality* and *Transubstantiation*, because the highest *Transubstantiators* have used the same terms; which may have their truth, respect being had to what is exterior to the Sacrament.

By the Application of which Rule, you see, Sir, it is not difficult to answer, not onely to this passage, but also to all those, which Monsieur *Arnaud*, and your other Doctors cal-

alledge

dge out of the Fathers, where the *Eucha-* is called the Body of *Christ*, since that is erm which we do not reject, and which may ve a very true sense according to *us*; and cannot be objected to us, because it is not compatible with our Belief, but consists with as naturally, as it doth with yours.

But I answer *Secondly* to this passage, that onsieur *Arnaud* is very much out, when he oposeth it to us as the minde of the Greek urch. It is an instruction of the manner, w an Anchorite is to receive the Sacrament, the absence of a Priest; and he that speaketh d giveth the instruction, is an *Archbishop bject to the Church of Rome*, as Monsieur *Ar-aud* hath said himself, *Pag.* 244. of the *Refu-tion*. For, though he be a Greek by Nation, nd have written in Greek, that concludeth ot, that these men were of the Greek Re-igion; so that, although there were in the Text, *then adoring or bending the knees thrice*, (as Monsieur *Arnaud* had translated it) yet t were no great wonder, that in the Tenth Age, in which time we grant, that *Transubstan-iation* was received in the Church of *Rome*, n Archbishop, subject to this Church, should speak conformably to what was practised in his time.

The second example of the Opinion of the Greeks of the Tenth Age, will not prove more favorable to Monsieur *Arnaud* than the first. It is of a She-saint called *Theochriste*, (in the Seventh Book, *chap.* 9. *pag.* 726.) who prayed

prayed a Hunter, that had by chance met h in the Isle of *Paros*, to bring her the next p the *Eucharist*; which having been done him, this holy Woman took it with great spect, cast herself on the ground, and w tears in her eyes said that Verse of the S of *Simeon*: *Lord, now lettest thou thy serv part in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy Sa our, which thou hast prepared before the fac all people.*

This passage, which hath been cited by C dinal *Perron*, is taken out of *Metaphrastes*, Author whom Cardinal *Barronius* accuse for often delivering Fables, Lies, and Ph cies; so that in reason, we may suspect wh ever he relateth. But to wave this, as al that, in all appearance, this Author was a Ste coranist, since he speaks, somewhat before th place, *of a piece of the Flesh of Jesus Chri* which is a thought, no more savoring of *Ro* than of *Geneva*; Monsieur *Claude* had a swered very well, that this passage could no work in us what it aimed at, since the Reform ed Churches of this Kingdom, after the Com munion fall down upon their knees, and sa the whole Song of *Simeon*, and yet do no therefore believe *Transubstantiation*, nor th *Adoration* of the Sacrament. Besides, he ob serveth, that this History shews the contrar of what is pretended, since, if then it ha been believed, as it is now, that it were th very Body of *Jesus Christ*, they would no have trusted a Hunter with it, to hav

carrie

rried it upon his Faith to any one.

Monsieur *Arnaud* answers nothing to this f note, which yet is not inconsiderable; d to the *first*, he contents himself to say, *at the application, which this Saint made of Verse of* Simeon, *is an effect of the belief of Real Presence, which the* Calvinian *devotion it self will never raise to this motion; and if* Calvinists *practise it, it is upon this ac-mpt, that the truth of the Ancient Faith, hich they have abolished out of their hearts, mains yet engraven in some of their actions and ords.*

If Monsieur *Arnaud* is satisfied with such nswers as these, a very little will content im. As for us, we are more difficult, and e far from believing, that a Ceremony, which e our selves practise, should be contrary us. Monsieur *Arnaud* is deceived; *first*, that he remembers not his own maxim, which lately noted upon the former passage, *viz.* hat there are expressions, which seem con-rary, or which in one sense are contrary, but et in another sense agree very well; which is hen proved, when those expressions are used y those, who are of a belief contrary to hat, which is pretended to be conform to the ery same expressions. *Secondly*, in that Mon-ieur *Arnaud* imagines, that this part of the ong of *Simeon* produceth a motion repug-ant to our Tenents; which is not so, since all ur Churches have used it for so long a time, ithout finding this repugnancy. This cometh

from

from thence, that Monsieur *Arnaud* is
versed in our way, and that having been
therto employed in other affairs, and
against many other Adversaries, he hath
yet had much leisure to peruse our Books,
seen our Belief otherwise than in some
your most famous Doctors, such as are
Cardinals *Bellarmine* and *Perron*, who disg
it very often, and impute opinions to
which we have not. And it is from this in
ed Spring, that Monsieur *Arnaud* intend
draw our Morals, which he means to
against, with consequences built in the
And if he frames also our Doctrine after
mode, certainly we shall appear to be str
people; we see already a proof of it in
Book, where he saith frequently, that we
lieve, we receive nothing in the Sacram
but the *Figure* of the Body of *Christ*; wh
is very far from our Sentiments. Were it
for this want of knowing what we believe
Monsieur *Arnaud* would never go about
object against us such kinde of passages,
others, that are more formal, which we m
use of as well as you.

I cannot altogether blame him in this;
doth what he can, he hath no better coyn
pay that, which he stands engaged for; and
he cannot oppose good Reason and Authority
he pretends to save himself in the croud
his witnesses, good or bad: But, if he
found any Greeks of those Ages, who
said, *That the Sacrament of the* Eucharist

a testimony of the union we have with Jesus Christ, *forasmuch as he is not onely once dead and risen again for us, but also feeds and nourishes us truly with his Flesh and Blood, that we may be one with him, and have communion in his life; and though he be in Heaven until he come again to judge the whole world, yet we are to believe, that by the secret and incomprehensible vertue of his Spirit, he nourishes and quickens us with the substance of Body and Blood.* Or such words as these, *That we must believe those promises, which* Jesus Christ, *who is the infallible truth, hath pronounced with his own mouth,* viz. *That he will make us truly partakers of his Body and Blood, that we may possess him wholly, so that he may live in us, and we in him:* Or, *That God there gives us really and effectually what he represents:* Or, *That this Mystery surpasseth the reach of our senses, and the whole order of nature.* If, I say, Monsieur *Arnaud* had found some of the Greeks speaking after this manner, with what pomp would not he have set them out? He would not have failed to tell us, that between those people and us, there were no good understanding at all; such words as these, *The Body and Blood of Christ, Reality, Substance of the Body and Blood of Christ:* And these, *We must believe in the promises of* Jesus Christ, *who will make us truly partakers of his Body and Blood*; that in this *Mystery we are not to stand upon our Senses, nor the order of Nature:* Such expressions, I say, would be, according to Monsieur *Arnaud*, as so many

Thunder-

Thunder-claps against us, and as formal De-
sions for you, as the Council of *Trent* it se
Mean time, Sir, if you would know, ho
much he would finde himself deceived, a
with what little ground he would object the
passages as contrary to us, you may observe th
they are the very terms of our own Confessi
of Faith, and of our Liturgy.

You may thereby judge, *that* these expres-
ons, which are common to both parties, a
which they both make use of, are not prop
to decide our Controversie, and *that* they ca
not in reason be objected against the one, o
the other; *that* there must be other proofs t
declare, what was the opinion of those, wh
used them; *that* the doctrine elswhere justi-
fied will shew and determine the sense o
those expressions, but that *they* being alone
cannot precisely make out the doctrine of those
who have used them.

This Observation might serve for an Answe
to the whole Book of Monsieur *Arnaud*;
mean time this is not a place to consider it a
large, I hope I shall one day set it out better
in another Treatise, wherein, God permitting,
I shall prove, *that* the true Belief of the An-
tient Church about this point of the *Euchari*
is very hard to be known, *that* there are in-
numerable perplexities in it, and *that*, if the
Fathers have believed the Reality, as I see
no reason to doubt but they did, they have
believed it in such a manner, which neither you,
nor we, nor any other Christian Society would
approve of.

You

You may see, Sir, by this examen, that M. *Arnaud* hath not performed what he had promised for the Defence of his Book of the *Perpetuity*, as to the matter of his *first* supposition, whereby he did pretend to show the Impossibility of the Change (which we maintain to have hapned in the Church about the Ninth and Tenth Age,) upon this accompt, that the Schismatick Churches had the same Belief with the Roman; which could not be but by a continual succession of the same Doctrine, which they had received from their Ancestors, and could not have taken from *Paschasius*, as a person unknown to them: You may see, I say, the weakness of this ground by that of the proofs, which he hath produced of the Belief of the Greeks in those two Centuries.

But there is more than this; for Monsieur *Arnaud* doth not onely not prove, That the Greeks were of your opinion in the time of *Paschasius*, and the following Age; but he altogether forgets the other Schismatick Societies, about whom he made so much noise, who were comprehended in the first Supposition, and from whose opinion, as well as from that of the Greeks, he did pretend to draw the Fundamental Reasons of his Systeme.

I know very well, that he treateth in his whole Fifth Book of the Belief of the Oriental Churches, of the *Muscovites*, the *Syrians*, the *Armenians*, the *Nestorians*, the *Jacobites*, the *Maronites*, the *Cophtes*, and the *Ethiopians*: I know also, that Monsieur *Claude* having said,

 that

that in the Examen of the Change, happen in the Ninth and tenth Century, *The que was not of the whole Earth, but of the W that is, of the Communion of the Pope.:* Mo sieur *Arnaud* greatly triumpheth; and y may see, how he paraphraseth upon th words, according to the sense he attribute Monsieur *Claude*, viz. *Let it be so, that i is not the Question, I will not put my self to trouble of explaining, how the Doctrine of Real Presence and of Transubstantiation wa troduced in the East, in the Patriarchats of* Co stantinople, *of* Alexandria, *of* Jerusalem, *of* Antioch, *in the Churches of the* Armeni *the* Nestorians, *the* Jacobites: *Nor will I at trouble my self to divine, how it hath penetra into* Ethiopia, Muscovy, Mesopotamia, Geo gia, Mingrelia, Moldavia, Tartaria, *and* Indies. *It is better to say, It is not there; t will make the shorter work, and by this mea I shall free my self from a great embarasmen* (in the Ninth Book, *Chap.* 3. *pag.* 886.) A after he had affirmed in the following Page that it is material to know, how the Belief the *Real Presence* could be introduced in all those Countreys, as well as into the Lat Church, he addeth (*Pag.* 888.) *I see very wel that Monsieur* Claude, *as bold as he is, succum under the greatness of this undertaking, he is re rified with it, he renounces it, he asketh gra he would gladly that that might not make a pa of the question. The question is not,* saith he *of the whole Earth; what shall one say? Th*

in no way of contenting him: It is the question, in despight of him, since this Belief is established over all the Earth: It is a thing, which depends neither from him, nor from me: It is a necessary part of this great question, and which draws after it all the rest. Thus, since by a forced confession of his weakness he acknowledgeth, that he cannot say, There is made an Universal Change of Belief in all the East, he must abandon all the rest, and acknowledge, that all his means are ruined, all his engins shattered, all his projects overturned, and all his Suppositions destroyed.

But for all this, Monsieur *Arnaud* is very much out, and he saith nothing in his whole Fifth Book, that may serve to prove the first Supposition of the Book of the *Perpetuity*. To shew you plainly his illusion, you may remember, that, to prove the Impossibility of the Change, which we say was made by *Paschasius* in the Ninth and tenth Age in the Point of the *Eucharist*, the Author of the *Perpetuity*, and Monsieur *Arnaud* after him (if himself be not that Author, as it is very likely he is) hath taken for his first Supposition, that it was impossible, this Change should befal the whole Earth, because the Greek Churches, and the others separated from the Communion of *Rome*, could not have heard any thing of *Paschasius*, and were enemies to the Latin Church, of which they would have scorned to receive new opinions in such an important point.

To ſupport this ratiocination, it hath be ſuppos'd, that at the time, to which *We* aſſig this Change, all the Oriental Churches did be lieve the Real Preſence, ſuch as you believe now; and becauſe M. *Claude* would not gra this, M. *Arnaud* hath undertaken to prov it.

To this end, he hath begun with the Gre Church, and pretends to have made out t Belief ſhe had in the Ninth and Tenth Age. H hath done more, for he hath recited her ſen ments in the Seventh and Eighth Age, whic preceded *Paſchaſius*, and in the Ages whic have follow'd him untill now. I have exam ned above, what he hath ſaid about the Nin and Tenth Age, becauſe there are no other b thoſe, that are eſſential and able to ſerve th queſtion.

But as to the other Oriental Churches, M *Arnaud* looſes his ground; for although th whole force of the ſuppoſition of the Book, h defends, conſiſts in proving their conformit with the Latin Church in the Ninth and Ten Age, he ſets that time aſide, and almoſt all th Ages following unto our times, and conten himſelf to prove, that in the latter Ages, b principally in that, wherein we *now* are, thoſ great Societies have been, and are found t be in your Belief of the Reality, which ver thing he proveth but very weakly, and whic was not that which was properly denied by Mr. *Claude*, who had concluded himſelf to aſſer and maintain, that Tranſubſtantiation and th

Adoratio

doration of the Sacrament were received only in the Roman Church, without speaking of the Real Presence.

Now in this proceeding M. *Arnaud* is very palpably deceived two wayes, (for I will rather say, that he is deceived, then that he would deceive his Reader;) the *first*, in that he braggeth to have done, what he hath not done, or thought on; the *other*, in that all his proofs would be useless, if they were without exception.

The proof of these two Assertions is easie. For, as to the *first*, there needs no more but to use our eyes, and read his passages.

In the Ninth Book, *p.* 865. M. *Arnaud*, speaking of the Change made by *Paschasius*, saith; *This vision supposeth, that the Real Presence hath not been believed but in the Latin Church, and we have shew'd, that it hath been acknowledged formally and clearly by the whole Greek Church, and by all the Orient, both before and after* Berenger.

And, in the ninth Book, Chap. 3. pa. 889. M. *Arnaud* saith again; *If he tell us, that 'tis* Paschasius *that hath invented this Doctrine, and that it could not fall into any other Mans mind than his; we shall shew him the infinite number of Christians, who know neither* Paschasius *nor his Book, and yet in all times have made profession of this Doctrine: And so he is convinced of temerity and imposture. If he tell us, that the Popes have contributed by their Authority and Violence to make it to be received, we shew*

him those vast Nations, where the Popes exercise [illegible] *Jurisdiction at all, and which yet do as much* [illegible] *here to the Belief of the Real Presence, as the* [illegible] *ple that submit most to the Holy See.*

In the ninth Book, Chap. 10. pa. 951. [illegible] *certain* (saith M. *Arnaud*) *that one of* [illegible] *most remarkable circumstances of this Change* [illegible] *Belief touching the Eucharist, is, that it must* [illegible] *suppos'd to have hapned at the same time in* [illegible] *the parts of the World, and in all the Christ*[illegible] *Societies, in the East, in the West, among the L*[illegible] *tins, the Greeks, the Muscovites, the Armenia*[illegible] *the Nestorians, the Indians, the Cophtes, the* [illegible] *thiopians, the Jacobites. This circumstance* [illegible] *shows clearly the Impossibility of this preten*[illegible] *Change; wherefore we thought our selves oblig*[illegible] *to show so largely, that all the Societies, separ*[illegible] *ted from the Roman Church, were united* [illegible] *the same in the point of the Real Presence, and* [illegible] *Transubstantiation; and I think, we shall* [illegible] *be complain'd of, that we have not proved* [illegible] *enough.*

It is then very certain, that, according [illegible] M. *Arnaud*, the Belief of the Schismat[illegible] Churches in the time of *Paschasius*, is an [illegible] sential Circumstance against the Change, [illegible] which this *Monk* is accused. It is also certai[illegible] that M. *Arnaud* pretends to have proved t[illegible] Belief in an invincible manner; he is high[illegible] content; and he insults thereupon over [illegible] *Claude* very fiercely: but in truth 'tis a me[illegible] bravado; he hath not so much as thought [illegible] it, and those clear and formal proofs, tho[illegible]

proofs

proofs, which he taketh to be so satisfactory, are visions of the passion of M. *Arnaud*.

Take the pains to read his whole *Fifth* Book; if you can find there one only passage, proving, that the Oriental Churches, the Muscovites, the Armenians, the Nestorians, &c. did believe in the time of *Paschasius*, and before *Berenger*, the Real presence and Transubstantiation, I will undergoe such a condemnation as you shall passe upon me: But I am well assured, you will not find a word there of that assertion.

I am contented to keep you company in this discussion, and to assist you in the examen. Let us then follow M. *Arnaud*, and see, whether he hath acquitted himself of this important proof, as he braggs; but this shall be only within the compass of the design of this Letter, that is, in the Circumstance of the Time; This being sufficient for me, who leave the rest to M. *Claude*.

In the four first Chapters he treateth of the Belief of the *Muscovites*: but M. *Arnaud*, who confesseth, (in the fifth Book, Chap. 1. pa. 424.) that he speaketh only of the opinions they have at present, to conclude from thence what they believed formerly, doth himself sufficiently shew us, that these people are to be taken out of the Catalogue of those, whom he pretends to have believed Transubstantiation in the time of *Paschasius*.

'Tis the same with the *Syrians*, of whom he speaketh in the fifth Chapter, and for the opi-

nion of whom in the Ninth and Tenth Age produceth not one certain passage.

He examins the Sentiment of the *Arme-ans* in the 6, 7, 8, and 9 Chapters. But the ancientest testimony is taken since *Berengar* and consequently without that fatal *Epoch* which is in question: Besides, he grants, that these people have been accused long agoe, that they believe not the Real Presence and Transubstantiation, by Authors of their Religion against whom he finds difficulty enough to defend them; and even at present *Thomas Herbert*, an English-man, who hath travelled in their Country, relateth in the second Impression of his Book, that they believe not the Real Presence; which Mr. *Arnaud* could not answer, but by accusing his Interpreter of signal Imposture, and affirming, that there is no such thing in the *English* Original: But this accusation, which doubtless was pronounced too rashly and too passionately, comes from thence, that M. *Arnaud* got the Book in the first Impression interpreted to him, where that Note of this Author is not; whereas M. *Vilfort* hath translated into French the *Second* Impression, where it is, as you know, Sir, that M. *Arnaud* hath acknowledged himself.

In the Tenth Chapter he treateth of the *Nestorians*; and in the Eleventh of the *Jacobites*. Therein he applyeth to both the same rules, and goes about to prove their Belief by *Negative* proofs; but besides the weakness of such a testimony, he finds no Authors to support those

ose proofs but in the Thirteenth Age, that is, ur Ages after *Pascasius*.

The *Maronites* (of whom he speaketh in the welfth Chapter) submitted themselves to the hurch of Rome at the end of the Twelfth ge, and although that Union did cool for me time, yet it was very solemnly renew'd nder the Popes *Leo* X. and *Clement* VIII; so at 'tis certain, they do now follow the *Roman* eligion, except certain Greek Ceremonies. M. *Arnaud* agreeth to these Truths, so that if e means to oppose to us with reason the exmple of that People, he must prove, that in he Ninth and Tenth Age they did believe Transubstantiation; and this it is, what M. *Arnaud* pretends to make out by positive passages, taken out of the Notes of *Abraham Ebhollensis*, a Maronite, upon the Catalogue of he Chaldaick Books of *Abdiesu*.

The first is ascribed to *Iohn Maron*, who lived, as he saith, between the Sixth and Seventh Age, where 'tis said, *That the Bread, which Iesus Christ took into his hands, blessed, consecrated, and called his Body, is the Body and Blood taken from the Virgin Mary; And that the same hand, which in the beginning took the dust of the earth, and by changing it, formed the Body of Adam, changeth also this Bread, and maketh of it the Body of the Word, taken from the blessed Virgin, and by changing this wine maketh of it the blood taken from the same.*

The second is taken out of the Syriack Constitutions of the Church of the *Maronites*, put into the Arabick Tongue by *David* Archbishop

bishop of the *Maronites*, in the Year 10[illegible] where 'tis said, *That the Apostles did eat Flesh, and drank the Blood; that the Bread made Flesh, and the Cup is truly the Blo[illegible] Christ.*

Much might be said to these places; [illegible] the latter of them, which *Ethellensis* rela[illegible] to be but a Translation made into Ara[illegible] *An.* 1053, carrieth with it visible mark[illegible] its being suppositious: for, it was made b[illegible] before the re-union of the *Maronites* with t[illegible] *Roman* Church, and yet he saith, that our S[illegible]viour at the time of the Institution of t[illegible] Sacrament, took *Unleaven'd* Bread; which [illegible] an evident token, that this Book is much ne[illegible]er, because that all the Greeks, and oth[illegible] Schismatick Societies have alwayes believed that the Eucharist was not to be dispensed w[illegible] *unleavened* Bread. And then he saith also, th[illegible] *Jesus Christ* lifted up this Bread with his hand[illegible] which no Evangelist relateth, and therefore i[illegible] meer Invention of the Author; as is that al[illegible] which he alledgeth in the third place, Th[illegible] Jesus Christ *declared to his Apostles, that t[illegible] Lamb, which God had commanded Moses to o[illegible]fer, was the Figure of this Bread, which had be[illegible] made Flesh and was now his Body; and that t[illegible] Blood, which ran out of it when it was sacrif[illegible]ced, was the Figure of this Cup, which was no[illegible] Blood.*

So M. *Arnaud* may but quote passages, h[illegible] looks not very near to them, nor examin[illegible] strictly whether they be receivable. I pray, as[illegible]

him, Sir, Whether he believeth in earnest, t this passage be before the year 1053; and ether he knows not, in what Author, he that the Author of these pretended Constitutions of the *Maronite* Church, hath found this mparison, which our Saviour made to his postles, of the Pascal Lamb with the Bread of e Eucharist; of which no Evangelist, no postle, not any of the Fathers, nor any Coun-l ever hath spoken a word.

As to the *first* passage, if it be truly cited, e Author was of the opinion, which was ommon amongst the Greeks of that time, of hom S. *Iean Damascen* made himself as it ere the Head in the *Eighth* Age; *viz.* That e Bread was made the Body of Christ by the nion made with his natural Body, by the peration of the Holy Ghost; or he was of the pinion of those, who believed, that the Bread was the true Body of Christ, and was corruptible. But you are of neither of these wo opinions. What ever it be, M. *Arnaud*, who quoteth this place as conform to your Belief, dareth not sign it; and, if he should do it, I am sure, that the number of his Approbators would not secure him from the Censure of the *Sorbon*, which will never approve of the Doctrine of this Author, *viz.* That the Body of our Lord is made of Bread, and his Blood of Wine, as Adam was made of the dust of the Earth: And if, notwithstanding these words, alleged by M. *Arnaud* in great Letters, *he changeth the Bread, and maketh of*

it

it the Body of the Word, (which do plainly ac-
that the Bread is the matter of the Body
Christ,) you will not have them thus expou-
ed, you cannot give them a more favourab-
sense than that of *Iohn Damascen*, who d-
believe the Assumption of the Bread and
Union to the Body of our Saviour: which
another opinion, which you reject as well
we. And thus both these places are altogeth-
useless.

What he saith, in the Thirteenth Chapter,
the *Cophtes* and *Æthiopians*, will not serv-
him better; for he only speaketh of the b-
lief they have now, which is a very ill arg-
ment to prove their Belief in the Ninth a-
Tenth Age. 'Tis true, he pretends to prov-
their Opinion further off, by Liturgies of th-
Nations, but to no purpose for the matter i-
hand, because he noteth not, nor can note, th-
these pieces were in the Ninth and Tenth Age-
such as we have them now; and secondly, be-
cause all those Liturgies, which are pretended-
to be ancient, are not so, and additions hav-
been made to them from time to time, as Car-
dinal *Bellarmin* did acknowledge, who in h-
fourth Book of the Eucharist, *Ch.* 13. answer-
ing the Greeks who alleged them, saith
That many things have been added to them
And indeed they are very differing from on-
another in their several Editions; especially
M. *Arnaud* telling us, that the *Ethiopick* Li-
turgy is conform to that of St. *Basil*, suffici-
ently declares to us the uncertainty of *that* b-
th-

uncertainty of *this*: For, though it may true, that St. *Basil* hath made a Liturgy, cannot be that, which is alleged by *Proclus* triarch of *Constantinople*; for in that which have, the *Trisagion* revealed to this same *oclus* is found; and the *Greek* is much more ple than the *Syriack*. Neither can it be the turgy ascribed to St. *Chrysostome*, which rdinal *Perron* saith, the *Egyptians*, *Cophtes* d *Æthiopians* used, since in this there is ention made of persons, which lived long af- St. *Chrysostome*.

There is then nothing certain in all that, and least there is nothing certain for the time of *aschasius*, and the Age that followd him, hich is the only point in question. For as to e Age wherein we live, or the precedent, ges since *Berenger*, no consequence can be rawn from thence. And this is the second il- sion of M. *Arnaud* touching this matter.

And indeed, since the whole force of the gument, proposed by the Author of the *Per- tuity* against the possibility of the change ade by *Paschasius*, consists, in that the Greek hurches, and the others, separated from the hurch of Rome, had the same Belief, which his Monk is accused to have introduced; to hat purpose is it to speak of the opinion, hich this People entertains at present? For enter not into an examen of the proofs of M. *Arnaud*; I leave that to M. *Claude*, and will suppose, that all these proofs are con- vincing: But I maintain, that they are useless

to

to the present Question, for as much as th
cannot be any consequence drawn from the
lief that now is, to that which was forme
since there may have hapned a change since
establishment of the Doctrine of Transubs
tiation in the Latin Church, either by the m
ture and commerce of the Latins and Gree
or by the voyages of the *Portugals* and o
Nations in the Oriental Churches.

The example of the *Maronites* manifes
proveth what I say; for no consequence c
be made from the Belief they now have tou
ing the Procession of the H. Ghost, and
leavened Bread, to that Belief which they h
when the Greeks made a Schisme upon th
points: One cannot, I say, object to the ot
Oriental Churches, that there hath been
change about these Doctrines in the Rom
Church, for this reason, that the *Maron*
would have opposed it; and to prove, that
the time of the Schism this people did belie
the same thing with the Church of *Rome*, o
cannot allege their present Doctrine, since
certain, that this People hath changed th
Belief above 400 years agoe. Thus, thou
it were true, that all the Eastern Churches d
now believe Transubstantiation, yet that co
cludeth nothing for M. *Arnaud*, because
change may have been introduced during th
space of 800 years among those Nations,
it was introduced in the Western about th
Ninth and Tenth Age: And M. *Arna*
argues, as if I should say, that *Berenger* i
trodu

oduced nothing new in *France* about the mat-
r of the Real Presence, and that this Change
as impossible, because that some people, ex-
remely remote from this Country, and who
ever heard of *Berenger* nor his Books, were
ound at that time in the Belief of *Berenger*;
nd that thereupon to prove the Doctrine of
he People in the time of *Berenger*, I should
roduce proofs of the Belief of many Provin-
es of the East and West-Indies, which have
ow the same opinions with *Berenger*; which
ould not be difficult to do, since the *English*
nd *Hollanders* setled in that Country, would
e able to give us sufficient testimonies there-
f, and Liturgies withal, written in the Lan-
guage of those Nations.

You see, Sir, by these Examples, that to sa-
isfie the argument of the Book of the *Perpetui-*
y, the question is not of the present opinion
f the Eastern People; and by the Examen I
ave been making, you may find also, that the
riumphs of M. *Arnaud* about this point are
maginary, and that he hath not proved at all,
hat in the time of *Paschasius*, and the follow-
ing Age, the Schismatical Churches were of his
opinion. And this is that which I undertook
in the beginning of this *Section* to show; We
must now proceed to inquire into the other
supposition, on which the Author of the Book
of the *Perpetuity* grounds his impossibility of
Change attributed to *Paschasius*; but, this will
well deserve a particular Reflexion.

The

The Sixth Reflexion.

IT is surprising enough, that Monsieur *Arnaud* should so perpetually delude his Reader. I have already observed to you, in my *First Reflexion*, that he hath fought almost nothing else, but his own shadow, onely defended that which was not denied, that which was not in dispute; and I have been lately proving it more particularly to the *First Supposition*, in the precedent *Section*.

I intend to shew you in this, the like deviation as to the *Second Supposition* of the Book of *Perpetuity*. Monsieur *Arnaud* employs the whole *Sixth Book* to maintain it; but (as I have already observed it in my First *Reflexion*) this whole Book is useless, for it onely proveth, that the Christians had in the time of *Paschasius* a distinct Belief of the Real *Presence* of *Jesus Christ* in the Sacrament, and of his *Real Absence*, and that Monsieur *Claude* had not contested with him about this; but onely carried the Question to *Transubstantiation* and *Adoration*.

Thus to bring things to the true state of the Question again, and to the force of the Argument of the Author of the *Perpetuity*, we must examin them otherwise than Monsieur *Arnaud* does

loth. For, since we do all agree, that the people in the time of *Paschasius* were to believe the *Presence* or the *Absence* of *Jesus Christ*, we ought indeed to finde out that which maketh the difficulty, and upon which the Author of *Perpetuity* hath pressed his Impossibility of that Change, which we accuse *Paschasius* of. Now this cannot be the bare Belief of the *Real Presence*, or *Absence*, because of the ambiguity there is in these general terms, seeing that we believe both of us, that we are to eat the Body of *Jesus Christ*, and that it is present in the Sacrament; so that the meer Doctrine of this could not cause a division in the mindes of Men; there must be something else, which was, the *Manner* of this *Presence*, that is, the *Transubstantiation*, and the worship which necessarily followed this Doctrine, which is the *Adoration*.

As for *Transubstantiation*, that hath made no impression upon the Author of the *Perpetuity*, to form his Argument of that, he hath not had it in his eye: And Monsieur *Arnaud* grants this in his Sixth Book and elswhere; seeing very well that he was not able to prove, that the people in the Ninth and tenth Age had a distinct Belief of *Transubstantiation*.

But as to *Adoration*, that serveth for a sole ground to the second Supposition of the Author of the *Perpetuity*; *that* he sets out on all occasion, and presseth it incessantly; and that division of the Spirits, which, according to him, would have been found among Believers,

wers, in case that *Paschasius* had introduc
new Doctrine, is grounded onely upon
diversity of the Worship, which it w
have caused; and upon this Ratiocinat
that they would have looked upon one an
as Impious, or as Idolaters.

Mean time Monsieur *Arnaud* in this w
Sixth Book, where he treateth of the Se
Supposition of the Book of the *Perpet*
saith not a word of this *Adoration*, wh
lone made up the force of this Second Su
sition.

But as I do intend to shew his weakn
both these Suppositions, I am obliged to
things into their true order, and to bring
into the right way, to examine whethe
hath well proved, that in the Ninth and
Age, the people did so believe the pre
of the Body of *Christ* upon the Altars, a
give it the Soveraign worship of *Latria*.
if he prove not that, this second Suppos
remains destroyed, and all the reasonin
its Author, grounded upon the accusatio
Impiety or Idolatry, which this change w
have caused, will be useless, and the Im
sibility of that change, which we alle
grounded upon this principle, will be not
but a *Chimera*, and a Vision.

Monsieur *Claude* finding, that the Supp
tion of the Author was convincing, if it
true, hath maintained, that *Paschasius* b
his change with the *Doctrine*, and not wit
Worship; that he taught *Transubstantiation*,

Adoration; and that the Doctrine of the Corporal and Substantial Presence having been taught by way of explicating the ancient Doctrine, and having by this way little by little surprised and drawn to him the mindes of people, the *Adoration* followed after with all the Ceremonies and Pomps; and that consequently that Division of Spirits, which the new opinion of *Paschasius* would have caused, would not have obliged the people to an open rupture of communion, as the Author of the *Perpetuity* did pretend, because both did agree in one and the same publick worship, which had not yet received any Change.

He extends this Ratrocination farther, and in the Eighth Chapter of the second Part of his Answer to the second Treatise of the *Perpetuity*, refuteth accurately all what Monsieur *Arnaud* had there said, concerning the *Adoration*; and he proveth these Four particulars.

First, That the *Adoration* of the Sacrament was unknown to the Ancient Church.

Secondly, That the first Authors of *Transubstantiation*, neither pressed it, nor publickly established it.

Thirdly, That it was not constituted by publick Decrees, but some time after these Councils, which condemned *Berenger*.

Fourthly, That the Schismatick Churches did not receive it.

How, think you, doth Mr. *Arnaud* clear himself from these Propositions. Truly Sir,

in a pittiful manner; and although this be the most important part of his Book, he dare not look the difficulty in the face, he looks onely side-ways on it, he fights against it flying and speaketh almost not of it, but occasionally.

For the first Question, which concerns the Belief of the Antient Church, he giveth over the proofs thereof to the victorious arms of his Adversary, and replies not a word to them.

The second, which is the onely Essential for the defence of the Second Supposition of the *Perpetuity-Book*, hath no more advantage than the first, and Monsieur *Arnaud* gives not any succors to it, and that rather out of weakness, than negligence.

For the two remaining, he saith somewhat more of them; but because what he saith of them is little considerable, and serveth nothing to the purpose of this discourse, I shall not insist on it, but shall onely confine my self to my design, and shew, as in the former Section, That Monsieur *Arnaud* hath not at all proved, that in the Ninth and tenth Age, the people did adore the Sacrament of the *Eucharist*, and consequently hath not at all made out the Second Supposition of the Book of *Perpetuity*, grounded on this *Adoration*, which would have made, as he pretends, the Followers of *Paschasius* to be looked upon as Idolaters, by those who were not of his opinion, if it had been new, and

which

hich at the same time would have obliged his followers to hold his Adversaries for Impious.

I leave to Monsieur *Claude* to examine what concerns the Belief of the Latins and Greeks of other Ages, because that respects him in particular, and maketh nothing for the Book of *Perpetuity*.

Monsieur *Arnaud* treats not of this matter in its true order; the Sixth Book, where he speaks of the Second Supposition of the Book of the *Perpetuity*, was the place to examine it, because it was not to be separated from the distinct Belief of the *Corporal Presence*; the force of the Argument of that Author consisting in the *Adoration* of the Body of *Jesus Christ* present, as I have observed above. Neither doth he handle this Question directly, and with a design to refute what Monsieur *Claude* had said of it; but he speaks of it occasionally in his Tenth Book, where he at large sets forth the consequences of the Nine foregoing Books. Let us now see what he there saith of it.

It is in the Ninth Chapter of this Tenth Book that he speaks of this *Adoration*, and he there employs Twelve Pages, onely to tell us these Three things.

First, That he hath proved positively in the Books preceding this, That the *Adoration* hath been practised over all the Earth.

Secondly, That there is an *Interior Adoration*, and another *Exterior*, and that the lat-

ter is of many sorts, of which, none is nec-
sary.

Thirdly, That the Universal consent
the Belief of the *Real Presence* (which he pr
tends to have proved) carries necessarily w
it the Belief of the *Adoration*.

But these three Propositions are ei
false, or useless to the matter under consider
tion.

As to the first, I do not examine the Posi
Proofs of *Adoration*, which Monsieur *A*
naud may have alledged in his Work, as
the Ages which have followed the Tenth, b
cause that belongs not to our Question: Bu
assert, that he hath not one, neither of t
Latin nor the Greek Church, for the time
Paschasius, and the Age next following; whi
is the thing in question, in the Second Suppo
sition of the Book of the *Perpetuity*, that b
ing founded *upon* the *Presence* of *Jesus Chr*
adored on the Altars by the Faithful; *up*
the impossibility of the insensible Change
which we put in the Ninth and tenth Age
upon the diversity of the Worship, which t
Change would have introduced upon the no
and upon the rupture of the Communion
which this new-born Idolatry would ha
caused; *upon* the great division, which wou
have been in all Families, in all Towns, a
in the whole Earth, by such an extraordina
and surpressing innovation as this; whic
would have caused, that the people wou
hav

ve looked upon one another as Impious or Idolaters.

These, Sir, are the exaggerations of the Author of the *Perpetuity*. But he hath laid a foundation without Proof, and Monsieur *Arnaud* abandons him in his greatest need, seeing he doth not verifie this decisive matter of fact at all. It is true, he brags to have done it; but what he hath done, belongs not to the fatal *Epocha*, which is in question, and at most, regards onely the time posterior, and principally the Opinions of the Oriental Church at present, because Monsieur *Claude* had extended thither the difference of the *Adoration*.

As for me, who examine onely what is essential, and the true difficulty, I insist onely on the Supposition of the Book of the *Perpetuity*, which Monsieur *Arnaud* hath undertaken to defend, and I maintain, that he hath not any Positive Proof, That in the Ninth and Tenth Age the people did adore the *Eucharist*.

What I say, may be easily verified; there needs no more but reading, and the perusing of the places, where Monsieur *Arnaud* speaks of this *Adoration*.

Concerning the *Greeks*, he examines their Belief, during the Seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth Ages, in his Seventh Book; but of all that he alledges of the two last Age, which are in question; there is nothing that can serve for his subject but the two examples, which the Author of the *Perpetuity* had been

to look for in Deserts, and had applied to the *Adoration* of the *Eucharist*; the one is of an Anchorite, called *Lue*; and the other, of a Solitary Woman in the Isle of *Paros*. But I have showed in the precedent *Reflexion*, that these passages, which Monsieur *Arnaud* has quoted in the matter of the *Real Presence*, were of no use to him; the former, because it stands upon the unfaithful interpretation of the Greek Text, the word *adoring*, being foisted in; the other, because it concludes nothing but by a Consequence drawn by Monsieur *Arnaud*, which is so pitiful an one, that all our Churches do practise, after the Reception of the Sacrament, the self-same thing which was done by that Solitary Woman.

As to the Latin Church, Monsieur *Arnaud* examines the Sentiments thereof, during the Age of *Paschasius*, in his Eighth Book; but there is not one word in it of the *Adoration* of the Sacrament. Thus you see the Second Supposition of the Book of the *Perpetuity*, altogether destitute of Positive Proofs. Let us now examine, whether the other Propositions of Monsieur *Arnaud* are able to supply this defect.

The second (*Pag.* 74. of the Tenth Book, *Chap.* 9.) contains the distinction between *Interior* and *Exterior Adoration*, and the Observation he maketh, that the latter may be extreamly diversified, and that there is not any *Exterior* sign that is in its nature fixed to the

Sovereign

Sovereign Adoration; this Ceremony differing according to places and times; so that it cannot be concluded, as doth Monsieur *Claude*, That, if certain *Exterior* marks of *Adoration*, which are used in one Church, are not practised in another, the *Adoration* is not believed nor practised in this Church.

But this discourse, which is very true, hath nothing that conduceth to the Question, I grant, that the Feast of the Sacrament; the Sound of the Bell for advertizing the people to adore it, either at the Mass, or when carried in the Streets; the Solemn Procession, wherein it is publickly adored with extraordinary pomp; the Confraternities established for its honor; the exposal of it made on Altars; are not marks absolutely necessary of the *Exterior Adoration*; a Church that practiseth none of all these Ceremonies, may adore the Sacrament, and use other tokens thereof. Nor hath Monsieur *Claude* said the contrary, in the manner Monsieur *Arnaud* hath represented, for to cause great exclamations against him. He hath onely asserted, That if the Antient Church, or the Church of the time of *Paschasius*, had adored the *Eucharist*, she would not have failed (*Pag.* 402.) *to do, at least as near as might be, the same things, which the Latin Church hath done after the establishment of the Transubstantiation.* And in another place (*Pag.*405.) he saith, *That if the Antients had believed what the* Roman *Church believeth this day, they would have done, at least, a*

good

good part of what she doth. And so his Po-
position is not so general as M. *Arnaud* h
made it.

To consider things at the bottom, M. Cl
hath reason, and M. *Arnaud* concludeth
thing: For, what ever it be else, it is not
answer pertinently, to examine the *least* o
Objections of M. *Claude*, and to pass by t
rest without saying any thing to them. And
this examen, it doth not satisfie the intent
of the Book of the *Perpetuity*, to go about
show, that the objection made to it is not c
siderable; he ought to have gone further, n
proved, what was alledged as matter of F
by the Author of that Treatise.

In short, although M. *Arnaud* endeavou
to winde himself, as much as he can, out of t
proof of the exteriour Adoration, seeing ve
well that he cannot make it out; yet he
constrain'd to acknowledge, that the peop
ought to adore the Sacrament, not only with
Interiour Adoration, but also an Exteriour
by some action of outward respect (in th
Tenth Book, Ch. 9. pa. 76.) and by some out
ward actions of Adoration, whatever they b
(ibid, p. 78.) And, without these visible a
external marks of Worship, given to the S
c a nent, how could the proposition of th
Book of the *Perpetuity* be maintained? Ho
could the people look upon one another, eithe
as Impious, or as Idolaters? How could th
Novelty of this Belief and religious respe
have made a Noise, and caused a rupture o

Com

communion, if this Worship, which would have been the cause of all the scandal, had only been Interiour, if the Adoration had only been in the Breast, and if in the outward Actions there had been no difference?

So that, it being certain, that this Adoration ought always to have had exteriour marks, M. *Arnaud* was not to content himself to show, that those, which M. *Claude* opposeth to him, might be separated from it, and that it was sufficient there were others; but he ought to have showed us, which were those other marks, and prov'd, that they had been observ'd in the time of *Paschasius*, and in the next following Age? But this he hath not thought upon; and if he should think on t hereafter, I dare say, he would not be able to give us any one positive proof of the Exteriour Adoration of the Sacrament, in those two Ages, leaving him the choice of all the tokens, by which he shall endeavour to make us acknowledge this Adoration.

But as he is very able and very dextrous, he hath not failed to see the weakness of these two Propositions I have been examining, that is, the weakness of the positive proofs of the Adoration; wherefore, for his last and principal defence, he maketh consequences his refuge, when he saith (the same Chap. p. 73.) *The Adoration is really inclosed in the Belief of the Real Presence, and absolutely inseparable from it; so that, having proved the Consent of the Societies of the East, in the Doctrine of the Real*

Real presence, we have proved their Consent the Adoration. Mean time (so he saith so pages after, viz. *p.* 78.) *M. Claude, by an incredible subversion of reason and common sense, by committing in one and the same subject all the faults that can be committed in it, at the same time that he will not acknowledge, that the Doctrine of the Real presence cannot be severed from the interiour Adoration, and from some kind of exterior worship, and that he pretends that since* Paschasius *unto* Alger, *that is, near 900 years, the Real Presence hath been believed without adoring Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, is not wanting at the same time to draw extravagant conclusions from these particular ways of Adoration, which are not necessary consequences of the Doctrine of the Real Presence, nor of the Adoration, to the end that he may shew by the defect of these Practises among certain people, that they did not adore Christ in the Eucharist.*

Behold, Sir, a terrible Censure, and a fierce accusation against honest M. *Claude.* Yet I think not, that he will find any great difficulty in freeing himself from it, and what he is accused of, is so easie to be overthrown, that 'tis matter of wonder, how Mr. *Arnaud* came to be so prejudiced against his Adversary, that he did not perceive his own delusion, and the distemper of his Gall. If a man would proceed against him with the same stile, would there not be more reason to accuse him for drawing *extravagant conclu-*

sions

ns from divers particular wayes observed. the celebration of the Eucharist, as of eeiving it on the knees, or of saying a erse out of the Song of Simeon after the ommunion; which he objects to us as in-ncible proofs of the Adoration; although ey be not only no inseparable marks there-f, but besides so indifferent things, that Pro-estants themselves do observe them? Whereas M. *Claude* hath all on his side, nd reasoneth very well, when he proves, hat the Sacrament hath not been adored, n a time when nothing was said, nor done of hat is said, and done now about this matter. And this note remains inviolable, until Mr. *Arnaud* shall destroy it by a proof of con-rary actions, or by alledging other Ceremo-nies than those, which are at this day in use: which is that he hath not done, nor will be able to do. So that I see not, what cause he had to make so much noise. Nor is there more cause for the ground of Mr. *Arnauds* Proposition; and I do maintain, that if there be *an incredible subversion of reason and common sense*, it is to be met with in the discourse of M. *Arnaud* rather, than in that of M. *Claude*.

And indeed the Proposition of M. *Arnaud* is false, both in its principle and consequence; he layes an ill foundation, and if it were certain, the conclusion, he draws from thence, is not warrantable. Thus may be returned to him what he so liberally bestows on

M. *Claude*,

M. *Claude*, by saying with more Justice, t
he hath done, *That he hath committed in*
and the same subject all the faults that
be committed in it.

First, It is not true, *That the Adoration*
really included in the Belief of the Real P
sence, and altogether inseparable therefrom. P
which we need no other proof but the prac
of the Lutherans, who do very well separ
these two Beliefs, and believe the Real P
sence, without adoring neither the Bread
not *Jesus Christ*, inclosed in the Sacrament.

But because it may be answer'd, that t
Lutherans do what they do because they b
lieve not the Transubstantiation as you, t
do fear, least they should adore the substan
of the Bread together with the Body of Chri
I say *secondly*, two things: First, that there
as much danger to Adore the Accidents, wh
remain according to *you*, as the Substance
the Bread, which remains according to *the*
and that therefore this consideration shou
oblige you to separate the Adoratio
from the Belief of the Real Presence. Second
ly, that all the necessary consequences of
opinion have not alwayes their effect, as M
Claude had noted *p.* 421, who had allege
some examples of it, to which M. *Arnau*
would not take the pains to answer. However
be, there are great reasons, in my opinion, n
to Adore the Sacrament as you do, althoug
the Corporal presence be believed; and the
are the reasons, which I hope I shall have op
portunity

rtunity one day to shew you (in another reatise) or the like, which might oblige *Pas-sius* and his Followers not to introduce this doration into the Publick Service of the hurch; so far is it from being a necessary onsequence to adore *Jesus Christ* on the Al-rs, and under the Accidents of Bread, that n the contrary, in this conjuncture, 'tis a ne-essary sequele of the Soverain veneration we we him, not to Adore him there, least we hould fall into the sin of Adoring the Crea-ure in stead of the Creator, or at least joint-y with him.

Besides, 'tis not true, that M. *Arnaud* hath *roved the Consent of all the Societies of the East, n the Belief of the Real Presence*, in the Ninth and Tenth Age, as I have show'd above, and by consequence 'tis not true, that he hath *proved their Consent in the Adoration.* So that there is neither positive nor consequential proof of the chief matter in controversie betwixt him and M. *Claude*: And by the Examen of these three propositions, you see, Sir, that the *Second* supposition of the Book of the *Perpetuity*, grounded upon the Adoration of the Eucha-rist, on which he laid the greatest stress, hath not been better defended than the *First*; And that so we must not wonder, that this Work hath not had that effect amongst us, which he expected from it, because that, besides the ex-traneous and accessary reasons, I have obser-ved in my four first Reflexions; I have made out, that he hath not at all proved the pre-

tended

tended impossibility of that Change, of w
we accuse *Paschasius*; and that the two Su
sitions of the Book of the *Perpetuity*, on w
that impossibility was grounded, are Su
sitions in the Air, Chimerical, without Pr
and Reason.

Thus you see, Sir, in general, what are
thoughts concerning the Book of Mons
Arnaud, and the Reasons, which, in
Judgment, have kept it from finding that
plause and success, which many expected fr
it. It may be, you will not be of my min
However, you have required, I should
you without complacency, what I believe
of it. I have done it with a design, onely
please you, notwithstanding the troublesom
interruptions I have from the unhappy Su
of Law, which have detained me in this To
these two years, remote from my House, a
from my Books. And this consideration may al
excuse the faults of a Tract I have made
haste, and among so many Distractions. I d
not pretend to meddle in so famous a Contro
versie, as this is, between two such Illustrious
Champions; although I could not be accused
of temerity, if I did, since the Cause is
common, and that others have sometimes ap
peared in the field, without being called to it.
Yet, Sir, if any one should go about to quar
rel with me for it, you will not take it a
miss, that I make you the cause thereof, and
call upon you for my warrant, to shew to the
Republick, that your command alone did cause

my

his engagement, and that I could not refuse to your merit, and to the honor of your friendship, a thing of this nature.

At least, I perswade my self, that those two persons will have no cause to complain of my conduct. For, as to Monsieur *Arnaud*, it is indifferent to him, to combat with one or the other, besides that, I look not at all for an answer from him; this Discourse was not made for that purpose: And if I accuse him of weakness in his reasonings and proofs, I confess ingenuously, that it is rather the fault of the matter, than of the Workman. But he would follow a Plane, which the Author of the *Perpetuity* had traced against the Rules; and he would prove the Belief of the *Real Presence* by abstract and metaphysical by-ways, and by meer Ratiocinations, which are not able to prove it. He would pass on further, and maintain, That the Fathers had believed *Transubstantiation* and the *Adoration* of the Sacrament; and this is a meer Paradox. Thus the subject, he hath undertaken to defend, hath constrained him to conclude himself within certain Suppositions, impossible to be maintained. He hath wanted neither dexterity, nor light, nor heat; but he hath wanted a subject capable to receive the form which was intended for it. I am therefore not unwilling to acknowledge his merit and his great parts; and all I can say about this matter, is, That he hath done all it whatever could be done, and that he hath defended a very ill cause with

a very good grace, and an admirable ab-
dance.

As to Monsieur *Claude*, I believe not
that he will be offended at this small di-
course. It was not made for his defence;
should be presumptuous, if I thought,
needed a second; and if I should offer h
so weak an one, in case he needed any.
work, which hath made such a noise, wh
hath charmed his Friends, and astonished
Adversaries, which hath expressed Elo
from the most passionate persons for your
ligion, maketh us hope for another, wh
shall accomplish his Triumph, and assure
him the Victory, which Monsieur *Ar*
hath gone about to dispute with him, ra
by Number than Valor, and rather by
Bigness, than the Reasons of his Book. N
ther do I attempt any thing upon his right;
leave him still all the particulars to be ex
ned; I enter even but a little upon the e
tial considerations, neither do I speak of t
farther, than I was obliged to answer the
sign of this Discourse. Certainly we fol
very different ways, and as we have no c
merce together, and that he will not see
Discourse before it is published, nor
but then, I believe not, that we do me
the same path. I do not pretend to sha
his Laurels, and as my whole end hath
onely to satisfie you, I there stop the
success of this Discourse, wherein I have
onely the Right of Nations, and the Lib
re

ceived in the Republick of Letters, to eak ones minde of the work of another.

But it is time to make an end of this Tract, hich is too long already, and much longer, an I purposed to make it at the beginning. I ve no more to add to it, but onely this reeſt, that you would continue to love me; wiſh it with all my heart; you are good and nerous, and therefore I promiſe to my ſelf at favor, notwithſtanding the Diſputes of *me* and *Gerova*, ſince in the hopes, that we ll meet one day in Heaven in the ſame inde, and the ſame felicity, I am on Earth as uch as I can be

SIR,

PARIS.
Jan. 28.
1670.

Your very humble
and very obedient Servant

VIGIER.

FINIS.